

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Modern Churchmen have got their opportunity at last. Year after year they have met in conference, made speeches, and departed. This year they met at Girton College in Cambridge. By some unexplained providence the reporters of the daily newspapers looked in upon them. They discovered heresy, or invented it. The cry was taken up throughout the country. And now the speeches, exactly as delivered at the Conference, are published in the September number of *The Modern Churchman* (Oxford: Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). If the Modernists have a message the world is ready to receive it.

We have called them 'Modern Churchmen' and 'Modernists.' They use both names for themselves. But both are objectionable. 'Modernist' is objectionable because it is ugly. Sir David Blair will shudder over it, as he does over 'scientist.' 'Modern Churchmen' is objectionable because it claims for a few what belongs to the many.

For if we are Churchmen at all we are Modern Churchmen. Our Gospel, it is true, is ancient. Make it as ancient as you please and we shall not be offended. But we carry it to modern men, in modern language, and with such modern interpretation as they can comprehend and profit by. If that is all that 'Modern Churchmen' means we are all Modern Churchmen.

But that is not what 'Modern Churchmen' means. As the men who met at Girton College, Cambridge, use it, it means something that is very different from that. But let us proceed in order. There are approaches to the meaning. The first speaker at the Conference made these approaches.

The first approach is by Dr. DREWS. Dr. DREWS does not believe that Jesus ever existed. It takes some courage to say so. But Dr. DREWS has it. And others have it with him. Even in our own country there are admirers of his, and followers. One of his followers is the Right Honourable J. M. Robertson, M.P. But the Conference of Modern Churchmen repudiated Dr. DREWS.

The next approach is by Dr. LAKE. Again and again was Dr. LAKE's name mentioned at the Conference. And his ideas were referred to more often than his name was mentioned. His colleague, Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON, was there to answer for him, and claimed that Dr. LAKE's writings were the occasion, not of the Conference itself, but of the subject discussed at the Conference. And the claim was admitted. For the subject discussed was the Centrality of Jesus. And it is the Centrality of Jesus that Dr. LAKE denies.

He does not deny that Jesus lived. But he denies that He was a person of any importance or had any considerable influence on the origin of Christianity. In the words of one of the speakers, Dr. LAKE holds that 'though Jesus existed, He did not really count.' 'Drs. Lake and Foakes-Jackson,' says the same speaker, 'appear to give us the picture of a very commonplace and uninspiring prophet,' who 'only taught much what other people had already taught, except for a few original remarks which were either untrue or quite impractical. He allowed His followers to address Him as "Sir," and He spoke of someone else as the Son of Man.' The Conference repudiated Dr. LAKE.

The third approach is by Dr. GLOVER. Only two or three times was Dr. GLOVER's name mentioned, and always with respect. Who would or could name him otherwise? Not only with respect, however, but with sympathy and agreement. For the speaker who named him was Mr. Nowell SMITH, Headmaster of Sherborne School, the most advanced of all the speakers at the Conference.

After some very personal and somewhat startling statements, Mr. SMITH proceeded to tell the Conference what Jesus did. He went about doing good; He taught and comforted and inspired 'in words and ways of which the Gospels preserve for us a wonderful, though no doubt fragmentary and sometimes perplexing, record; He impressed people in general with an exceptional sense of power, a sense generally, no doubt, accompanied by admiration and love, but in certain quarters, for obvious reasons, by fear and hatred; He gathered round Himself a little band of friends of a special intimacy, some of whom He called His "messengers," and who subsequently became the nucleus of the Christian community; finally, He suffered under Pontius Pilate.'

Mr. SMITH stopped there. Then, after a pause: 'Here you may say, "Why not go on, 'and rose again the third day from the dead'?" Yes, and

if I did, I should add, "and is alive for evermore and is spiritually present with us always, or, at least, when we are ready to receive Him." But I stop at the Crucifixion, not as denying the Resurrection or Eternal Life or the ever-living personality of Jesus (God forbid! I believe; God help my unbelief!), but because these matters which Popes and Councils have attempted to define, and for definitions of which men have fought and burned one another and split up into sects and parties innumerable, seem to me to involve so many terms and conceptions which I cannot grasp clearly enough to construct an intelligible, articulate, verbally communicable creed.'

'Admiration and love,' and 'suffered under Pontius Pilate'—it is Dr. GLOVER. And he also, when you ask him, Why not go on? answers that the rest belongs to theology; to Councils and Popes and creeds, and it is not for him to enter. But *can* he stop there? Is the rest theology? One of the speakers at this Conference of Modern Churchmen says very plainly that it is not. He says it is history.

'It is not good history,' says the Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, 'it is not good history to take the first three Gospels and ask what we can make of their story on the assumption that the Crucifixion is the end. One of the factors in the problem, to the most "objective" of historians, is that a unique movement took its rise from the career of the executed Nazareth workman, that for some reason the most astounding claims came to be made on His behalf by men who had known Him. How far these claims can be justified is a question for theology; that they were made is a fact for the historian. It is one of the things that he knows about Jesus, and no account of His career can be satisfactory which does not explain why these results followed from it.' The Conference of Modern Churchmen rejected Dr. GLOVER

And so we come to the Modern Churchmen and Dr. RASHDALL. We say 'and Dr. RASHDALL,'

for Dr. Hastings RASHDALL, Dean of Carlisle, is, without challenge, the theologian and leader of the movement. What does Dr. RASHDALL stand for?

When the newspaper reporters heard his speech, they reported that he denied the divinity of Jesus Christ. But, when he read their report, he wrote to the newspapers and said that he did not deny His divinity. He said that the very purpose of his speech was to assert the divinity of Jesus. And the reporters, when they read his letter, wondered.

But Dr. RASHDALL was right. He did not deny the divinity of Jesus. What he did, and what all the speakers at the Conference did, was to assert the divinity of man. All men, they affirmed, are in a measure divine; Jesus also was divine. Jesus, they hasten to say, was divine in fuller measure than other men. But it is still a matter of degree. Sometimes they use the word 'supreme.' Twice they use the word 'unique.' But the next sentence tells you that the meaning is the same. Jesus was unique because His divinity was so much more than the divinity of any other man.

In their report of Dr. RASHDALL'S address at the Cambridge Conference the newspaper reporters made a mistake. They said that he denied Christ's divinity. They ought to have said that he denied His deity. If they had said that he denied Christ's deity the Dean of Carlisle would have found no occasion to write to the newspapers; he would have felt no call.

For it must not be supposed that in saying we are all divine as Jesus was divine the Modern Churchmen meant to say that we are all gods. They make a distinction between God and man. Much as they have to say about the kinship between the human and the divine, they never say that it obliterates all distinction. Jesus was the best and greatest man that ever lived, but He

was still a man. Divinity is one thing, deity is another. There lies the difference between them and other Churchmen. There is the reason they have for appropriating to themselves the name of 'Modern Churchmen.'

Why do they deny the deity of Christ? They do not deny that His early followers regarded Him as God. Some of them assert that He did not claim deity Himself. Some of them assert that the earliest disciples of all did not attribute deity to Him. Both assertions are precarious and inconclusive. Certain it is that sooner or later the words of Thomas in the Fourth Gospel were the words which every one of His followers was ready to make his own—'My Lord and my God.'

Certain it is also that that is the belief of the Christian Church as a whole to-day. As we write there comes into our hands the September number of the *Record* of the United Free Church of Scotland. That Church has given much attention to learning throughout its history. It has within it a fair proportion of scholars to-day. The *Record* is its official organ. Now the September number contains a 'Brief Statement of the Church's Faith in Terms of Present-day Thought.' The Statement, we are told, was submitted to the General Assembly, and 'the Assembly not only commended the Statement to the interest and study of all members of the Church, but resolved that it should be circulated widely.' What does that Statement contain?

It contains a paragraph on the Holy Spirit which deserves to be recorded here. But we must be content to quote the three short paragraphs 'Concerning the Lord Jesus Christ,' for that is our immediate subject. These are the paragraphs:

'We believe that God so loved the world that He gave His Son to be the Saviour of mankind. We believe that this very Son of God, for us men and for our salvation, became man in Jesus Christ,

who, having lived on earth the perfect human life, devoted wholly to the will of God and the service of man, died for our sins, rose again from the dead, and is now exalted Lord over all.

'We believe that Jesus Christ is the Revealer of the Father, and that the mind of God towards the world must in all things be interpreted by the mind of Christ. We believe that when in our experience we are brought face to face with Jesus Christ we are in the presence of the eternal and holy God.

'Therefore, with the Church of all ages, we worship Him together with the Father.'

Now in the second of these three paragraphs there is not a word that Dr. RASHDALL could not assent to. But in the first paragraph and in the third there is not a word with which he would agree. The last short paragraph he would reject as surely as the Jews rejected Jesus' claim to forgive sins. He would call it simply blasphemy.

Why does Dr. RASHDALL deny the deity of our Lord? He does not deny it easily. It costs him not a little. As strongly as any man he feels the pull of the Christian centuries. As keenly as any he realizes the poverty of the arguments which have to be used in order to hunt this belief out of the New Testament.

He is confronted with the amazing assertion of the Apostle Paul in his address on the Areopagus. 'Inasmuch as he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.' Dr. RASHDALL knows how early in the history of Christianity that speech was delivered. Yet the resurrection of Jesus from the dead is there; and not as a disputed fact, but as the basis of an argument. And what is the argument? That this Jesus who rose again is to *judge the world in righteousness*.

Dr. RASHDALL, we say, feels the force of that

amazing claim. How does he meet it? He meets it by pointing to the word *man*—'that man whom he hath ordained.' As if he did not know that that word is used to identify the Judge with Jesus. 'That man,' as in St. Peter's Pentecost address, is the man who lived and moved among them. That man, says St. Peter, has sent the Holy Spirit. That man, says St. Paul, is to be the Judge of the whole world. And the Dean of Carlisle tells us that the use of the word 'man' is proof that He was man and no more.

Why, then, does Dr. RASHDALL deny the deity of Jesus Christ? The editor of *The Modern Churchman* gives us the answer.

The editor of *The Modern Churchman* is the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford. Besides contributing one of the addresses at the Conference, Mr. MAJOR has written an Introduction to the whole series of addresses as they appear in his magazine. In that Introduction he tells us that there are two things for which the Modernists stand. The one thing is the denial of the deity of Christ. The other is the denial of the miraculous.

Mr. MAJOR does not use the word denial. He is anxious to persuade us that the Modernists stand for positive truth not negative, for construction not destruction. He expresses the two positions in this way: 'Their first conviction is that there is not a vast gulf between the Divine Nature and the Human Nature.' And 'their second conviction is that God reveals Himself to man not through the abnormal, but through the normal.' We accept his positive statement. The meaning is the same.

But he places the two convictions in the wrong order. The denial of the miraculous should have come first. It is because the deity of Jesus would be a miracle that Dr. RASHDALL and his fellow-Modernists deny it.

May we touch this matter of the miraculous? It is the great religious difficulty of our day. Beyond everything else it keeps men who are scientifically trained from embracing Christianity. Beyond everything else it causes hesitation and heart-searching to the instructed preacher of the Gospel. Who will blame any man for seeking a way round it if he cannot see his way through it? The most that we have perhaps a right to ask him is that before he denies the miraculous entirely he should consider what the denial involves.

For it involves the tremendous assertion that the early Christians were mistaken in believing that Jesus rose again from the dead, although it is acknowledged by everybody that on that belief they built the Church of Christ. It involves the further tremendous assertion that the Church as a whole, with quite insignificant and ineffective exceptions, has found its strength for righteousness of life and the service of God in that belief.

Now we are not going to say that if you accept the resurrection of Jesus from the dead you may let the rest of the New Testament miracles go. But we do say that it is vain to explain this miracle and the other as due to misunderstanding, misreporting, or the use of the myth-making faculty in man. When you have explained them all, the resurrection remains, and the miracle of miracles is the resurrection.

The Modern Churchmen know it. At their Conference they scarcely looked at the other miracles in the Gospels. They returned again and again to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. What did they do with it?

Well, the striking thing is that they did not deny it. Perhaps Mr. Nowell SMITH came near to denying it. The rest did not even come near. For they hold that Jesus did rise again from the dead. Some of them hold that after He rose again from the dead He appeared to one and another of His disciples and even to a multitude

all at once. And if you do not read carefully you go away and say that after all the Modern Churchmen believe in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

Perhaps one of the speakers does believe in it—the Rev. E. W. BARNES, Sc.D., Canon of Westminster. Dr. BARNES says: ‘Did Jesus show Himself as the risen Lord after His death and burial? We cannot understand the history of the early Church unless this fact be admitted.’ Then in a footnote he explains his belief in this way:

‘The unifying element in personality is love, in the complete Christian sense of the word. At death the normal man is only in process of being made, and as an unfinished spirit must remain in time until his purification is ended. But if a finished perfected spirit were released from human limitations by death he would thereupon at once enjoy the fulness of eternal life. Since that life is outside time it is conceivable that such an one could reveal his presence as Jesus disclosed Himself after His resurrection. Herein we seem to reach the underlying thought of St. Paul when he associated sin with death: the restraints of death are restraints due to sin.’

That may not be the explanation of the resurrection which St. Paul or St. Peter would have given. It has a distinctly ‘modern’ flavour about it. But in any case Canon BARNES is not a Modernist. Why he was present at the Conference of Modern Churchmen, we do not know. For he told the Conference that he was not one of them. ‘I am an Evangelical,’ he said; ‘I am not a Modernist.’

How does the Modernist explain the resurrection? He explains it by saying that it was the spirit of Jesus, not His body, that rose again from the dead.

It takes some courage to be a Modern Churchman.

One thing more. The Modern Churchmen are greatly opposed to creeds and creed-making. Yet they cannot do without a creed. The editor of the Cambridge addresses puts the Modern Churchmen's creed into words. He calls it an affirmation, but it plainly is a creed.

Mr. MAJOR asks 'our traditionalist fellow-Churchmen' to accept this affirmation, "God was in Christ," with the practical recognition in daily life that "Jesus is Lord," as constituting the irreducible minimum for modernist membership in the Church and in the teaching and ministerial offices.'

'God was in Christ' and 'Jesus is Lord'—that is the creed. Will 'our traditionalist fellow-Churchmen' accept it? They will. We cannot think of a traditionalist or any other Churchman who will not accept it, *if Mr. Major will finish the sentence in the first part of his creed and give the full force to his words in the second part.*

The first part is 'God was in Christ.' That may mean nothing; it may mean everything. Browning tells us that the acknowledgment of God in Christ solves all questions in the earth and out of it. Or, better still, he makes St. John tell us so. Does Mr. MAJOR agree with St. John? If he does, why does he break off the sentence in the middle? 'God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto himself*'—that is the sentence. If Mr. MAJOR means that, his fellow-Churchmen will agree with him.

And the other half of his creed—'Jesus is Lord.' Again his fellow-Churchmen will agree, if Mr. MAJOR will give the word 'Lord' its full New Testament meaning.

Turn to the latest book on the subject—the latest, and the most thorough—Professor WARFIELD'S 'Study of the Designations of our Lord in the New Testament, with especial reference to His Deity.' The title of the book is *The Lord of Glory*.

Professor WARFIELD takes up the books of the New Testament one by one. He begins with the Second Gospel. It is the least likely of the Gospels to contain the full theological significance of the title 'Lord.' Yet, 'the use of "the Bridegroom" (in Mk 2^{19, 20}) as a designation of our Lord assimilates His relation to the people of God to that which in the Old Testament is exclusively, even jealously, occupied by Jehovah Himself, and raises the question whether Jesus is not thereby, in some sense, at any rate, identified with Jehovah. This question once clearly raised, other phenomena obtrude themselves at once upon our attention. We are impelled, for example, to ask afresh what sense our Lord put upon the words of Psalm cx., "The Lord said unto my Lord, 'Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.'" . . . Who is this "Lord" who is to sit at the right hand of the "Lord" who is Jehovah, and to whom David himself therefore does reverence? It is hard to believe that our Lord intended—or was understood by Mark to intend—by such a designation of the Messiah, who He Himself was, to attribute to Him less than a superhuman—or shall we not even say a divine?—dignity by virtue of which He should be recognized as rightfully occupying the throne of God. To sit at the right hand of God is to participate in the divine dominion, which, as it is a greater than human dignity, would seem to require a greater than human nature. To be in this sense David's Lord falls little, if anything, short of being David's God.'

Professor WARFIELD reviews the use of the term 'Lord' as applied to Jesus in St. Matthew and St. Luke. On the Synoptics generally he concludes:

'It is clear that the term "Lord" is sometimes applied to Jesus in the Synoptics in a height of connotation which imports His deity.'

In the Fourth Gospel Dr. WARFIELD comes upon 'the great passage (20²⁸) where Thomas' doubt breaks down at the sight of his risen Master and he cries to Him, "My Lord, and my God."

That this exclamation was addressed to Christ,' he says, 'is expressly stated: "Thomas *answered* and said *to Him*." The strong emotion with which it was spoken is obvious. It is not so clear, however, what precise connotation is to be ascribed to the term "my Lord" in it. There may be a climax in the progress from "my Lord" to "my God." But it seems impossible to doubt that in this collocation "Lord" can fall little short of "God" in significance; else the conjunction of the two would be incongruous. Possibly both terms should be taken as asserting deity, the former with the emphasis upon the subjection, and the latter with the emphasis on the awe, due to deity. In any event in combination the two terms express as strongly as could be expressed the deity of Jesus; and the conjoint ascription is expressly accepted and commended by Jesus. It must rank, therefore, as an item of self-testimony on our Lord's part to His Godhead.'

In the Acts Jesus 'is addressed by the supreme honorific "Lord," except in vii. 59, where he is addressed more fully as "Lord Jesus." It is clear that this formula is employed in all cases with the profoundest reverence, and is meant to be the vehicle of the highest possible ascription.' Again: 'It is quite clear that "the Lord" is a favourite designation of Jesus in this book, and was such also in the community whose usage it reflects. And it is equally clear that in the use of this term what is primarily expressed is the profoundest reverence on the part of the community, and the highest conceivable exaltation and authority on the part of Jesus Himself. It belongs to the situation that it is often extremely difficult to determine whether by "Lord" Jesus or God is meant. That is to say, so clearly is Jesus "God" to this writer and those whose speech he reports, that the common term "Lord" vibrates between the two and leaves the reader often uncertain which is intended.'

The use of 'Lord' for Jesus is much more marked in Paul. 'The simple "Jesus" occurs in

all the Pauline Epistles only some seventeen times, while the simple "Lord" occurs some 144 or 146 times, to which may be added 95 to 97 more instances of the use of "Lord" in conjunction with the proper name. And this constant application of the term "Lord" to Jesus must not be imagined to be merely a formal mark of respect. It is the definite ascription to Him of universal absolute dominion not only over men, but over the whole universe of created beings (Ph 2¹¹; Ro 10¹²).'

'That Paul usually has the exalted Christ in mind when speaking of Him as Lord is only a portion of the broader fact that, writing when he wrote, and as he wrote, he necessarily had the exalted Christ in mind in the generality of his speech of Him. He was not engaged in writing an historical retrospect of the life of the man Jesus on earth, but in proclaiming Jesus as the all-sufficient Saviour of men. That he recognized that this Jesus had entered upon the actual exercise of His universal dominion only on His resurrection and ascension, and in this sense had received it as a reward for His work on earth (Ph 2⁹; Ro 14⁹) merely means that, no less than to our Lord Himself, the earthly manifestation of Jesus was to Paul an estate of humiliation upon which the glory followed. But the glory which thus followed the humiliation was to Paul, too, a glory which belonged of right to Jesus, to whom His lowly life on earth, not His subsequent exaltation, was a strange experience. It was one who was rich, he tells us, who in Jesus became poor that we might through His poverty become rich (2 Co 8⁹); it was one who was in the form of God who abjured clinging to His essential equality with God, and made Himself of no reputation, by taking the form of a servant, and stooping even to the death of the cross (Ph 2⁶ *seq.*). When Paul speaks of Jesus, therefore, as "Lord" it is not especially of His exaltation that he is thinking, but rather "the whole majesty of Christ lies in this predicate" for him, and the recognition that Jesus is "Lord" expresses for him accordingly the essence of Christianity (Ro 10⁹; 2 Co 4⁵; 1 Co 12³; Ph 2¹¹).

The proclamation of the Gospel is summed up for him therefore in this formula (2 Co 4⁵); the confession of Jesus as Lord is salvation (Ro 10⁹), and it is the mark of a Christian that he serves the Lord Christ (Col 3²⁴); for no one can say that Jesus is Lord except in the Holy Spirit (1 Co 12³).¹

If Mr. MAJOR will fill his 'Jesus is Lord' with the full meaning which he finds in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, and finish his sentence, his fellow-Churchmen will gladly accept his creed. 'God was in Christ and Jesus is Lord'—it is a short creed, but it is sufficient.

'They went both of them together.'¹

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR J. GOSSIP, M.A., ABERDEEN.

NOBODY with the least touch of imagination, or any power at all to think himself into another's place, can read the story of Isaac's sacrifice without feeling something hard and cold gripping him tight about the heart. The situation is so merciless and so pathetic, and there is such a terrible restraint about the telling of it, like the deadly quiet of a stricken mourner who says nothing at all, because there are no words that could express it; makes neither moan nor crying, because she is beyond the help of kindly tears; sits dry-eyed, coldly ominously still;—a certain dreadful inevitableness about it all—that lengthy journey with the thing, thank God, yet far away, and God is very pitiful, who knows that He may not repent?—that first glimpse of the distant hills, at sight of which the father's heart must have stood still; and these two, all in all to one another, moving on alone; that sudden question of a half-awakened fear, with the lad's eyes full upon his face; the long climb with drawn, grey faces in that awful silence. As we read, the heart cries out with pain, struggles to help them somehow, as one moans and shudders in his sleep, so vivid and heart-breaking is it all, although the hearts that suffered have been still for some four thousand years.

Think what it meant to Isaac! For the lad knew, so I take it, what the end was going to be. In those days human sacrifice was common and habitual enough. Scholars, indeed, insist that the

full meaning of this story is that it was there on Mount Moriah that the truth first came home to any man that this thing must end, was really a monstrosity and an offence to God. However that may be, it was commonly practised in those days; and, with that grim background to his thoughts, his was no idle question shot at random out of simple curiosity; nor would it need a very subtle mind to hear in Abraham's guarded answer more than his heart could speak! And life is sweet; and he was young, when life is at its sweetest, was still dreaming his dreams, still looking out with flushed cheeks on that wonderful future which hid and held so much that his heart coveted. A little while and he too would set sail, and win the land where dreams come true. And, sudden as an arrow burying itself in his breast, came the cold, awful truth! And yet the lad went on. There are no hot reproaches, no wild outcry; but in tense and utter silence he climbed on and on, with what thoughts jostling one another in his mind, till Abraham stopped and said, 'Here is the place'—and—it had come.

And yet, surely, it is to Abraham that one's heart runs out first. Was ever man so agonized and tortured? The light of his whole life, and he must dash it out, and henceforth grope in a gross darkness! The boy, his boy, who filled his heart with hope and happiness! And he must make it empty, silent, and bleak! If Isaac knew that he knew, what must he be thinking? And if he did not know, how horrible to trap the lad like this, so innocent and unsuspecting! And all his hopes were centred upon him! Had not God said 'In Isaac' he would certainly be blessed—

¹ Mr. Gossip wishes it to be stated that the opening paragraph was suggested to his mind by a reference in one of Marcus Dod's letters to a sermon preached by Professor H. S. Coffin.

this Isaac within a few paces now of death? Did God then never keep His word—was there no truth in Him at all? It was so long now since he had set forth from Haran to inherit the land God had promised him, had surely promised him time and again; and his whole life had slipped away since then, and even yet he owned no foot of it, not even so much as would allow him bury his dead out of sight. And still his stubborn heart believed on doggedly; refused to cease to trust, even when further trust seemed simply silliness. God had said it; and on His word he leaned his whole weight unflinching. 'Mine eyes fail,' cries a Psalmist. 'I am growing blind looking for God,' yet I still peer out dimly and short-sightedly in His direction, am still sure that He will come. And Abraham's faith, too, held on through long barren years. And in the end, the very end, when hope's last dogged spark was winking itself out, that daring faith was justified, for the boy came. And with that God renewed the best of all His promises, and even added to them more and more. To Abraham himself, indeed, it could not be. He must go to his grave a homeless wanderer, must die 'in faith, not having received the promises,' still trusting to the very end. But the boy would enter into all his father's faith had won for him. So God had said, over and over—the boy, this boy. And now a second time He was fooling and cheating him. Why did He let him see the well at all, if he was not to be allowed to drink at it? Surely He knew that that could only make his heart yet thirstier! Why did He give the lad, only to take him back? Why had God lied to him—lied not once but a hundred times? Why in excess of cruelty did He make him the instrument for fooling his own faith and dashing out the hope of which his whole life had been one long, loyal pursuit?

What a wild tumult of emotions—outraged love, a father's breaking heart, a faith burdened till it could bear no more, could hardly stagger on where God directed—must have been surging and swelling within the man's soul, although he spoke no word, but climbed on steadily. 'So they went both of them together,' to and through their common sorrow; but, if the lad's face was drawn and pale, are there not beads of a far sorer agony standing out on the father's anguished forehead? No wonder they called Abraham 'the father of the faithful'! No wonder that a faith so remarkable,

and an obedience so complete, was counted unto him for righteousness. Once on a day the Prince of all Believers climbed a hill yet more steep, with a cross yet heavier pressing hard upon His heart, into a darkness even grosser and more black. For God had promised Him that He would save the world; and He was going to His death, with not one soul in all the world that understood or that believed, yet He went on unflinching. Where God led, there He would follow. And because of that undaunted faith of His, and that perfect obedience tested to the uttermost, He has destroyed our enemies, and won us our salvation. And in all history, perhaps, no act of any man comes nearer to His own than this uttermost sacrifice of Abraham, who gave his very all to a God who seemed faithless and discredited, climbing that other hill into that other darkness, with his hopes all shattered, and God's promises all broken, and his sore, lacerated heart pained all but past the bearing. Dr. A. B. Davidson was of opinion that the greatest act of faith recorded in the Bible, after our Lord's, was that of heathen Nineveh, who, when God threatened them with destruction in forty days, turned His threats and their very extraordinariness into a kind of promise, did not believe His threats. 'Who can tell?' they said. 'Unless some one can tell for certain that God will not turn and repent, they will wait. That is the length that faith will go; it will hold on by a thread so slender as that; it will hope in God's mercy when there is nothing to be said for, and everything to be said against it, short of this that no one can say for certain. Who knows? Who can tell?'

And that is very wonderful. And yet somehow this other grips one more. 'In Isaac shall thy seed be called,' so ran the promise. And yet Isaac he gave back to God.

Well, that is faith; that is what our Lord asks of us. Give Me faith, He says; and that is what He means by it; what He Himself gave when so asked; what He hoped we would grant to Him. And if we did, what would He not do in and through us. But, ah me, any tiniest pebble is enough to stumble us; and any smallest disappointment sours us and makes us grievously suspicious against God. Nothing of ours is threatened, but we cling to it, dour and sullen. Yet look at Abraham and look at Christ, and surely you will let it go, and remain quiet and believing.

'So they went both of them together.' But—the father's heart was sorest in the common sorrow. That is what we have found. And, to-day, has it come to be your turn to climb the hill of sacrifice, that long, hard hill that strains the heart and tires so cruelly? Something has happened; and the life that used to be so sunny has of a sudden become shivery and grey. There is no need to hurt the yet fresh wound, to make you wince by blundering into description and detail—your heart knows what it is only too well. And you are meeting it bravely enough, I do not doubt. Perhaps because you have acquired the art of leaving yourself absolutely in God's hands, have gained the peace and the serenity that come from that, like those that settle down on one when one starts on a long sea voyage, and has no frets nor cares, for there are others there to do the managing and guiding for him, and he need not worry over things. Or perhaps it is only with a certain apathetic courage that accepts what can't be helped. The thing has come, and there is nothing to be said. 'What does one do,' asks a character in Lucas Malet's *Wages of Sin*, 'when all the best is taken away from one, when life has grown trivial, stunted, narrow? After a time, my dear, one lights a candle called Patience, and guides one's footsteps by that.' Or perhaps it is with a heart struck cold and bitter, that can bear, but cannot understand how God could treat it thus; which may say never a word, but which is unbelieving and rebellious; has ceased to pray; has lost all sense of God's kindness and tenderness. Life was so happy until this fell suddenly out of the sky; and now everything is so different—life grown a thing to be endured, a burden to be carried with a panting and strained heart.

Yet, at least, you are not alone. Your Father is beside you: and the Father's heart is sorest.

Must it not be so? Is there any agony so terrible as to be called upon to stand beside one's little one in deadly pain?—too small even to tell you what is wrong, or to suggest how you might ease it—the little wailing voice; the hot, dry, restless hands; the head tossing from side to side with sleepless eyes, while the strength swiftly, steadily, keeps ebbing—is not that a far more intolerable thing than to be racked with pain oneself? And God is your Father, and you are His own child, and no one suffers but He suffers more cruelly than we ourselves. However lonely is the

road, you have one sure Companion; however personal the sorrow, one other heart is bearing it along with you; for it is His yet more than yours. So you 'go both of you together' down to the cold heart of what is a common sorrow—but—the Father's heart is sorest.

Can I see another's woe
And not be in sorrow too?
Can I see another's grief
And not seek for kind relief?
No, no! never can it be!
Never, never can it be!

Think not thou canst sigh a sigh
And thy Maker be not nigh!
Think not thou canst weep a tear
And thy Maker be not near!

O! He gives to us His joy
That our grief it may destroy:
Till our grief is fled and gone,
God doth sit by us and moan.

That is the very teaching of the Testament. It is rank blasphemy to think of God as outside of the suffering of the world—your suffering. It is cruel to rail against Him for His ordering of your life. For no one feels your difficulties as He does, not even yourself. It is a man of sorrows, one tired and aged before His time by the keenness of His sympathy, by ever entering into other people's troubles, by making them His troubles, by giving Himself without stint for their relief, whom the Gospels tell us is God's very image and His express likeness. Always there is that pain in God's eyes, always that sympathy wringing His heart. Whatever else and more the Cross means, surely it means this—that Maeterlinck is wholly wrong in picturing God as sitting smiling on a sunny mountain; high above, and untouched by the woes and miseries of this uneasy earth. Not sitting smiling, and not lolling at ease on a sunny mountain-side, but in the thick darkness at the very heart of the world's sorrows, bowed by a cross that even He could hardly carry, so grieved, so wounded, so heartbroken, there it is that we see God clearest, there that we understand what He is really like. Trouble has come to you, and we others turn into it to give you our kindly word or such help as we can, and then we go our way out of it all again. For after all it is not ours. But always it remains with you. Yet you are not alone in it. Whatever troubles you troubles God too; is His as much as yours; and you go 'both

of you together' up the steep hill of sacrifice. But the Father's heart is sorest.

Moreover, it is in the light of this that we must read the Master's sufferings and death. There have been explanations of the Cross which almost break one's heart to read, and do they not break God's?

Always when meditating on our Saviour's passion, let us begin by fastening on Paul's great words that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' or on those of the Gospel, 'God so loved the world that He gave up His only begotten Son' for it—His foolish, blundering, heartbreaking world.

So, when the Master climbed His hill of sacrifice, He did not go alone, but there was One beside Him suffering in His suffering, even more than He Himself. So they went both of them together to the Cross and darkness—He and God—and the Father's heart was sorest. What it all must have meant to God no human heart can ever picture. To watch the scoffing and the mockery, the spitting and the buffeting, and make no sign—the dreadful things which He hid from us yonder in the darkness, and the long hours of waiting there amid that ribald, teasing, cruel mob, before at last death came. How terrible is the restraint

of the Almighty, how fearful is His patience! 'Christ's atonement,' says Dr. Dods, 'was nothing more than His quietly and lovingly accepting all that sin could do against Him.' And He was not alone in that; for God was hurt by what hurt Him, was wounded by His wounds, and He, too, quietly and lovingly accepted it. There is a fine and mystical picture in our own National Gallery in London: Christ hangs upon the Cross; the darkness has more than begun to deepen; and at first that is all one sees. But, looking longer, one becomes aware that behind the Cross, supporting our Lord with His arms, and looking down on Him with infinite kindness, stands the Father. And His face, too, is grey with more than the Son's pain; and He, too, shares in the Saviour's agony. And is not that the supreme meaning of the Cross, and its chief terror?—that our sins, your sins and mine, hurt God like that; that always, always, always, He is wounded by them as our Lord was then; that it was not Christ only who climbed the grim, stony hill of sacrifice, and not Christ only who went down deeper and deeper through the darkness, but they went both of them together, the Father and He; and the Father's heart was sorest. Only at such a price, and such a cost, was our salvation won.

Literature.

THE NEW ATLAS.

WE have to scrap our Atlases. However much we paid for them and however much we love them, they have to go. It is a new world. It needs a new Atlas. So evident is it all that Messrs. Macmillan have issued *The Handy Royal Atlas of Modern Geography* without a word of preface. In place of a preface we find two highly coloured charts, a North Polar and a South Polar chart. We open it at the beautiful title-page. We turn over and come upon the dedication: 'To His Royal Highness Edward, Prince of Wales, this Atlas is by Permission most respectfully Dedicated.' We turn another page and read the contents. We turn one page more and we are in the midst of the maps.

The first is a Chart of the World on Mercator's

Projection. The second is a map of Europe! The very look of it is strange to us. Germany is now nearly as well proportioned as France. That Prussia which, since Frederick called the Great, had been all tail and the tail all sting, has had its stinging tail shortened, much to the benefit of its appearance on the map. And then to the East of Germany, here are two countries our maps had not shown since we began to study maps.

There are, besides the charts, fifty-two maps. They are all the work of Mr. G. H. Johnston, F.R.G.S., of the Edinburgh firm of Messrs. W. & A. K. Johnston, and they are of the finest workmanship. No attempt is made to catch the vulgar eye for bright colouring, yet some of them—we notice Switzerland unexpectedly for one—are quite arresting in that respect.

Upon the Index the utmost care has produced

the utmost accuracy. There are places mentioned in the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* which had been searched for in other Atlases not a few, and have now at last been found in this one.

LORD ROSEBERY.

For many years no great public event could be celebrated in Scotland without a speech from Lord Rosebery. So indispensable was he that on the anniversary day of the death of Robert Burns he had to deliver two addresses, one at Dumfries in the morning, and one at Glasgow in the evening. And assuredly he spoke well. He spoke so well, so clearly to the mind, so warmly to the heart of Scotsmen, that on many of these occasions the demand that the speech should be printed and circulated was irresistible. Now all these addresses have been collected into two fine volumes and published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton under the title of *Miscellanies Literary and Historical* (3os. net).

One volume is a banquet, two are almost revelry. For there is an attraction in the printed page scarcely inferior to the fascination of the living voice. You read and read, and as you read your appetite increases. The next to last address in the second volume is the wittiest thing in the whole book. Is it not also perhaps the wisest? Its subject is 'The Turf.' It was spoken at one of the annual dinners of the Gimcrack Club. Lord Rosebery, on that occasion, had the courage to say this:

'If I am asked to give advice to those who are inclined to spend their time and their money on the turf, I should give them the advice that *Punch* gave to those about to marry—"Don't." That, I admit, is a discouraging remark for an assembly of sportsmen, and I perceive that it is received in the deadeast silence. I will give you my reasons for that remark. In the first place, the apprenticeship is exceedingly expensive; in the next place, the pursuit is too engrossing for any one who has anything else to do in this life; and, in the third place, the rewards, as compared with the disappointments, stand in the relation of, at the most, one per cent. An ounce of fact is worth a ton of exhortation, and I shall give you my experience; and it will be an exceedingly genial and pleasant dinner if everybody truthfully gives us his.'

And he gave them his experience.

But that is enough about the Turf for us.

Of the biographical addresses the most famous is no doubt the Glasgow address on Burns. But more sympathetic, more Rosebery, is the speech on Chalmers. 'For he was one of the greatest of our race: a commanding character, a superb orator, the most illustrious Scottish churchman since John Knox. His memory remains green and vivid with us when statesmen, writers, and philosophers are, if not forgotten, languishing in the shade. It is a noble and blessed life, none more enviable.'

But if Chalmers is nearest the heart, nearest the soul is the speech on Cromwell. It was delivered at the Cromwell Tercentenary celebration in 1899. It strikes a loftier note than we have found in any other address in the book. And the note is loftier than we find in any other speech or essay or book, in recent days at least, on Cromwell. How it towers above Lord Morley's estimate, in spite of all Lord Morley's knowledge and eloquence! For a little while you are in the very presence of God. When will Cromwell's own countrymen be able to put prejudice by and see him as he was? Lord Rosebery admits the difficulty of the Irishman and the scarcely less difficulty of the Scotsman. But the Englishman?

THE LITERATURE OF AMERICA.

The third and last volume of *A History of American Literature* has been issued as two volumes with continuous paging (Cambridge: at the University Press, pp. xvi, 872; 6os. net). Fine volumes they are, and full of good reading. But the best service is rendered by the bibliographies which they contain. The utmost care seems to have been taken to see that the list of books and pamphlets and magazine articles on every chapter is complete and accurate. In this at least the American volumes strive to reach the standard of the volumes of the Cambridge History of English Literature, to which they are a supplement.

The American editors have thrown their net much wider than the English editors. We do not think of Abraham Lincoln as a man of letters, but here he is with a chapter all to himself. The English editors might on the same scale have given a chapter to Sir Robert Peel, from whose speeches passages may be quoted which, in the opinion of Lord Rosebery, are properly described as 'classical,'

and who in his sense of humour surpassed even Lincoln. Yet we would not have that chapter on Lincoln omitted. It is itself literature. There is not much quotation, but it is good when it comes. In February 1861, the death of one of Lincoln's children had produced an emotional crisis. 'For a time he was scarcely able to discharge his official duties. This was followed by renewed interest in religion, expressing itself chiefly by constant reading of Scripture. Whether any new light came to him we do not know. But in the autumn he wrote this: "The will of God prevails. In great contests, each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be, and one must be, wrong. God cannot be for and against the same thing at the same time. In the present Civil War it is quite possible that God's purpose is something quite different from the purpose of either party; and yet the human instrumentalities, working just as they do, are the best adaptation to effect His purpose. I am almost ready to say that this is probably true; that God wills this contest and wills that it shall not end yet. By His mere great power on the minds of the now contestants, He could either have saved or destroyed the Union without a human contest. Yet the contest began. And, having begun, He could give the final victory to either side any day. Yet the contest proceeds."' We are quite familiar with the words, but they never miss their appeal.

And thus the very question which these volumes raise is the question, What is literature? A chapter (by Dr. Lyman P. Powell) is given to the *Book of Mormon* and Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health*. Is the *Book of Mormon* literature? Is *Science and Health* literature? We have read both. The *Book of Mormon* is comprehensible, though on a low level; *Science and Health* is incomprehensible and impossible. And such possible English as there is in the book is due, we are told, to a reviser. Not all Dr. Powell's creditable cloak of charity can make it out to be literature. Yet again we make no complaint. The chapter may belong to the 'Curiosities of Literature,' but it is good to read, and its bibliography is invaluable.

To the inhabitant of the British Isles these volumes are of more consequence than all the literature which they tell the story of. The literature cannot occupy the mind with so much to be done in the reading of Shakespeare and Shelley.

But the life that is expressed in that literature demands study. The third volume opens with Mark Twain. No Mark Twain has been possible here. The proper appreciation of Mark Twain seems to be impossible. We touched him gingerly for a little: then we dropped him. But Mark Twain is a product of a heredity and environment which we must know. These volumes offer us the unique opportunity.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

Dr. R. J. Campbell has reached the height of his ambition. He has written *The Life of Christ* (Cassell; 8vo, pp. x, 367; 12s. 6d. net). It is a worthy ambition, and it has been reached worthily. Not to disarm criticism, but out of the fine candour and Christian simplicity of his character, he explains that the material which he had gathered had to be cut down to the dimensions of a mere outline—he calls the book 'a short study'—but he hopes to supplement it some day by a homiletical commentary on the Gospels.

The most striking thing about the book however is not its condensation. That is probably all to the good; for preachers are apt to be wordy. It is its orthodoxy. A few years ago Dr. Campbell preached a sermon in the City Temple on the Virgin Birth. We remember reading it in *The Christian Commonwealth*. In that sermon he expressed his doubt of the value of the doctrine and his own unbelief in it. Now he accepts it unreservedly. 'The whole life of Jesus is one long miracle; He Himself, as we have seen, is the supreme miracle; why hastily conclude that in the manner of His birth there could be nothing supernatural, nothing differentiating Him from mankind at large?'

More than that, he accepts the miracles every one. If there is a moment's hesitation over the Gadarene swine, it passes into acquiescence. 'If demon possession is to be accepted as a fact, and no one who knows the evidence will dispute it, there is no reason to doubt that inferior creatures can occasionally be so possessed as well as human beings. It is less likely, for human beings frequently open the door to this distressing affliction by their own vices, and discarnate spirits would naturally prefer human organisms to those of the lower animals. Wicked and degraded spirits—earth-bound as they are called—are said to seek

every opportunity of gratifying sensual appetites, and their own means of doing so is to obtain control, partially or completely, of the bodies of beings still in the flesh and whose habits are in affinity with their own.'

HUMAN EVOLUTION.

Professor Edwin Grant Conklin of Princeton has been lecturing at the University of North Carolina on 'the mutual bearings of science and religion upon each other.' The lectures have now been published in this country by Mr. Humphrey Milford of the Oxford University Press, under the title of *The Direction of Human Evolution* (12s. 6d. net).

First of all, you are arrested by the frontispiece. It is the only illustration in the book. It is a reproduction of those models of prehistoric man which Dr. J. H. Macgregor of Columbia University has made from the skulls discovered here and there. One is the *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, one the Neanderthal Man, and one the Cro-Magnon Man. The progress in humanity is strikingly, too strikingly, visible. But given millenniums enough between them, and evolution hard at work all the time, and what else should there be?

And certainly Professor Conklin is ready to grant millenniums. 'The stratigraphical evidences indicate that in Europe the existing species of man goes back at least 20,000 to 30,000 years.' Then on another page: 'At a venture it may be said that the Neanderthal race lived somewhere between 25,000 and 100,000 years ago.' And remember that the Neanderthal race is the same race as that to which you and I belong. Professor Conklin will not have it that the world was created 4004 B.C., but if you choose to interpret creation in terms of evolution he will agree with you that there was only one pair at the beginning and that all the races on the face of the earth have sprung from 'Adam and Eve.'

One chapter, sure to trouble the optimist and give momentary pleasure to the pessimist, is on the peopling of the earth. It is not merely the possibility of every acre being occupied, with consequent fightings without and fears within; more than that, it is the possibility of the inferior races—the red, the black, the brown, or the yellow—getting the upper hand of the superior white race. At present the white race has it, both in influence and in

numbers. This is Dr. Conklin's table of numbers:

'White race about . . .	550,000,000
Yellow race about . . .	500,000,000
Brown race about . . .	450,000,000
Black race about . . .	150,000,000
Red race about . . .	40,000,000.'

Dr. Conklin is not himself afraid. He says, 'In spite of the occasional alarms which are sounded with regard to "race-suicide" it is evident that the white race is at present increasing more rapidly than any of the other human races. This is due not merely to the larger area which it controls, but also to its greater agricultural, industrial, and scientific development. While the birth-rate is falling everywhere, the death-rate is falling more rapidly among whites than among other races.'

DELUSION AND DREAM.

Professor Sigmund Freud has discovered a way of commending his Psycho-analysis to the wide world. He stumbled one day on a tale by Wilhelm Jensen. It was a tale in which dreaming played a part. It was, moreover, a well-told tale, likely to be widely read and talked about. He seized the tale, commented on it psycho-analytically, and then published tale and psycho-analysis together. The whole, translated into English by Helen M. Downey, M.A., and introduced by President Stanley Hall, has been published in this country by Messrs. Allen & Unwin under the title of *Delusion and Dream* (12s. 6d. net).

Norbert Hanold was a well-to-do young German who had begun to study, and collect, antiquities. On a journey to Italy he obtained a bas-relief of a young woman, which fascinated him chiefly because of the way in which she walked. The foot rose on the toe to a right angle. He had never seen any one walk so gracefully. He watched women walking—no one lifted herself on her toe with such a springing step. Then he dreamed. He was in Pompeii in 79 A.D. The eruption was in full flow. Suddenly he saw the very person of his bas-relief. She stepped across stones with that springing step. Then she vanished—perished in the fumes and the overflowing lava. He revisited Italy, was drawn irresistibly to Pompeii. He looked at this excavated building and at that. Within one of them he came upon Gradiva. He had himself given

that name to the maiden of his bas-relief. Was she a modern woman or was she one of those who had been overwhelmed in Pompeii in 79, and now was permitted to return at intervals to life? He addressed her in Greek, in Latin. She advised him to try German. It is well told, perhaps a little drawn-out. She made herself known at last as his old comrade, still living in the same street, if his eyes had not been given so utterly to casts of bas-relief, and all's well that ends well.

That story, we say, Dr. Freud comments upon psycho-analytically. His comments occupy half of the volume. Perhaps it is the most successful, certainly it is the most attractive, method he has yet hit upon for explaining what Psycho-analysis is.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF OUR LORD.

All religious phenomena are now explained by the application of the science of psychology, and our Lord is not allowed to escape. The most ambitious effort to regard *Jesus Christ in the Light of Psychology* has been made by Dr. G. Stanley Hall, Professor of Psychology, and President of Clark University. His book is now issued in this country by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (2 vols, 8vo, pp. xix, 733; 30s. net). But Dr. Hall's ambition overleaps itself. He does not explain Jesus Christ. If there are perplexities in the nature of our Lord, he removes none of them, but makes them more perplexing, and adds to them. We can read the Gospels with interest, with enjoyment even, we believe with moral and spiritual advantage. We have difficulty in merely reading Dr. Hall. For he uses words we never saw before—mythopheme, erethic, ambivalent, dysphoria, thumic, hebamic, equipollence, agoraphobiatic, schizophrenic, and many more. And he manufactures sentences that are ungrammatical when intelligible, as 'We find many of the same uncertainties as to the precise way in which he reached the sense of sonship, that we have seen exist concerning how he attained Messianity.' Or sentences that are unintelligible when grammatical, as 'Here Jesus is made to seem persuaded to make an exception to the rule of helping Hebrews, first by a deft, repartee-like plea of a gentile mother who bested him by turning his semiparable on her side and against him.'

We have difficulty in reading him. But when we have striven to overcome that difficulty, we have before us the far greater difficulty of getting

any good out of what we read. We say at the end of the second volume, that if this is the best that can be done for us by psychology in the interpretation of the Lord Jesus Christ we may leave psychology alone.

And yet President Stanley Hall has worked at his subject. The first volume of his book is taken up mostly with a criticism of the Lives of Jesus. It is a tremendous list, but he appears to have read the whole of it. And the criticisms are nearly always just as well as acute. He prefers Keim's *Jesus of Nazara* to all other biographies (a judgment, by the way, with which Professor Moffatt would agree) and he gives good reasons for his preference. What he does not seem to have read sufficiently is the four gospels. He has not got the 'hang' of them. They are ill-constructed, confused, contradictory, and they are nothing more. The imperious spirit that makes them what they are to others has not been felt by him. He takes them to pieces and puts the pieces together again after his own mind, not without a sense of superiority. How much better it might have been done! How much better it would have been done by a Professor of Psychology!

Nor does the Christ of the Gospels escape handling. There were things he should not have done. Dr. Stanley Hall, in like circumstance, would not have done them. Thus, 'He dared to take the rash and perhaps ill-considered step of pardoning the sins of some he healed.' He had, of course, no power to pardon sins, being such an one as we are, and not without sin. For if it is probable that President Hall has not carefully enough studied the Gospels, it is quite certain that he has not reverently enough studied the person of Jesus Christ. His purpose is to explain that person psychologically. His failure is complete, and its completeness is due to the fact that he is so comfortable in His presence and so confident that he can explain Him.

And yet even Dr. Stanley Hall sees that Jesus had something which we have not. He calls Him Son of God in some sense which is never clear but is evidently intended to express uniqueness. And once in a curious passage he warns us against finding the *whole* of God in Jesus. He says: 'The great achievement wrought by Christianity of casting man's ideas of the divine into a specific, unipersonal, human form did, but should not, make us forget the greater God of all nature,

animate and inanimate. It is excessive anthropomorphization of religion that has caused its tragic age-long warfare with science. The substance of the Godhood that did not and could not all go over into Jesus the Christ is still worthy of adoration and service. This overplus was the Deity that Jesus Himself adored. Indeed, it is only the pathetic *Enge des Bewusstseins* on our part that makes us think that to be truly Christian we should know and serve Jesus only. It needs no very profound psycho-analysis to show that the most devout of all Jesus' disciples from the beginning to our day make him the chief but never the only divinity that they worship. The germs of all the old faiths still live in us all, and alas for Christianity if they were not there! We might as well try to extirpate the scores of rudimentary organs in our body as to eliminate these. We must not only revere the Most High of the Psalms and Prophets, but what large and true Christian heart does not warm to the pantheistic sentiment of the great poets and philosophers and feel the lure of the best that is in all the great ethnic Bibles? Otherwise why do or can we study comparative religions? Children in their plays and toys, and adults in the charms and ornaments they wear, are fetish-worshippers, and under stress of feeling we all become primitive animists. Thus there has never been a complete kenosis of any of the antique or transcended faiths and cults into Christianity. The æsthetic feelings still worship the blue vault above, the heavenly bodies, clouds, rain, lightning, wind, water, fire, trees, flowers, and animals. Each of these has at some time or place long been the very highest object of the religious instincts, and alas for us if these vestiges are rooted out from our souls! We have thought too meanly of Man-soul. It has many mansions, and it is enough if we keep the best of these sacred to the God of our Scriptures. Only in the cruder past did the new God evict, diabolize, or slay his predecessor. No man can be Christian in the sense too usually required with more than a safe working majority of his faculties.'

THE ANGAMI NAGAS.

The race between the archæologist and the missionary is being run. The archæologist must be there before the missionary has civilized the natives. There is no love in the breast of the

archæologist for the missionary. Mr. J. H. Hutton, C.I.E., M.A., hurrying to that wild borderland between India and Assam, where dwell *The Angami Nagas* (Macmillan; 8vo, pp. xv, 480, with illustrations; 40s. net), finds the missionary before him, busily obliterating those signs of savagery which are the archæologist's delight, and he is antagonistic at once. He says little. When he speaks it is cuttingly. 'Of the spirits revered by the Angami there are a number, both of persons and of kinds. Nor are their qualities by any means so malicious as they have been painted. The missionaries in their blindness teach the Angami convert to regard all *terhoma* as evil, and mission-taught Nagas are in the habit of translating the generic *terhoma* into English or Assamese as "Satan." All of these "satans," as they call them, are, however, very far from having those qualities which we traditionally associate with the Devil, and the qualities of some of them are definitely benevolent.'

It is clearly professional prejudice. Mr. Hutton himself, as he proceeds, gives up the attempt to show that the *terhoma* are benevolent, or other indeed than just devils. It is with the Angami Nagas as with others at their stage of civilization, their life is obsessed with the fear of evil spirits, and benevolence in God or devil is not much thought of. 'It is noticeable,' says Mr. Hutton, 'that houses visited by sickness are protected by rough masks cut out of bamboo bark to represent a face, holes being made for the features, a rude device seen among the Konyak tribes in the much more elaborate form of regular faces, painted and grotesque. It is perhaps a matter for speculation as to whether these faces were originally intended, like the gargoyles of Mediæval Europe, to frighten away evil spirits, or whether it was intended that the spirit of the mask should wrestle with the spirit of sickness, or whether the mask was first put up that the sickness might seize the mask instead of a human being. Ordinary panjis are put up over the door of the house together with the masks, and a fire is lighted in the centre of the doorway. These precautions are believed to prevent those who go in and out from taking infection from the sick man. Evil spirits and bacteria seem to be much the same thing. In any case they can be deterred from attacking the person by the device of carrying in the hand, or licking and sticking on to the forehead, a bit of wormwood

(*chena* or *pina*) leaf, which is apparently most obnoxious to the spirits of disease. Children are particularly susceptible to attack, and a woman travelling with an infant in arms protects it by carrying a reaping-hook held in front of her, to the haft of which a bit of wormwood also is often tied—as a sort of disinfectant, in fact.’

Whatever the book may do for or against true religion it is a real and valuable contribution to science. There are even illustrations of Biblical antiquities in it. You will find the Angami legend of the Tower of Babel on another page.

A HISTORY OF LABOUR.

Mr. Gilbert Stone, B.A., LL.B., sometime Secretary to the Coal Industry Commission, has written *A History of Labour* (Harrap; 8vo, pp. 416; 15s. net).

It is a large subject for a single writer and a single volume. But Mr. Stone is an experienced writer, and the volume is a large one and well filled. The ground covered is even greater than the title claims. History has to do with the past. But only the first half of the book is occupied with the past. The second half is given to an investigation of present conditions and future tendencies.

As we have said, Mr. Stone is a writer of experience and writes well. He makes no effort to be literary, still less does he attempt oratorical effect. His style is quiet, steady, effective. It is possible to read the book without emotion; it is impossible to read a page of it without understanding.

And as his style, so is his argument. He desires as sincerely as any man improvement in the conditions of labour. But when he is confronted with the alternative to that attainment of evolution or revolution, he has no hesitation in choosing evolution; he has no reluctance in urging evolution on workers and their employers alike, as the only method making for progress.

‘We look rather’—this is how he ends his history—‘we look rather to the general spread of education, true education that informs the mind and teaches it to reason, as the great hope of the future. Man long ages ago emerged as the grand selected animal to whom the power of thought and ordered analysis of causes and effects was given. Through the ages he has toiled along the road that Nature then opened to him. He will

find his final salvation when, discarding the methods of the brute, he at length directs his course of action according to his reason, and when that reason is cultivated to its highest and is equipped with knowledge. That is the grand movement that will most surely solve our present ills.’

THE HUMAN RACE.

Mr. Albert Churchward, M.D., M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., F.G.S., who not long ago wrote a book on the ‘Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man,’ has now written a Supplement to that book, and called it *Origin and Evolution of the Human Race* (Allen & Unwin; 8vo, pp. xv, 511, with illustrations; 45s. net).

He has written this Supplement in order to answer the critics of the previous book (and he answers them energetically), and also in order to make clearer and more emphatic the position adopted in that book. What was the position? It was that ‘the Pigmy was the primary Homo, evolved from a *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, or Anthropoid Ape, in Africa over a million years ago.’

Here are three statements. First, the home of man as he emerged from the ape was Africa; next, the emergence took place over a million years ago; and lastly, the earliest man was a Pigmy. Now all these statements are controversial. Dr. Churchward is aware of it. Throughout the book he defends them all. And, as he passes on, Sir John Herschel, Professor Sollas, Professor Keith, and even Sir James Frazer, all come in for castigation. Dr. Churchward has read somewhere, ‘Spare the rod and spoil the child.’ He spares it not.

The original home was Africa. More exactly Dr. Churchward says: ‘It was in Africa the little Pigmy was first evolved from an Anthropoid Ape—in the Nile Valley and around the Lakes at the Head of the Nile (which I will, for the sake of brevity, style “Old Egypt”).’

On the date he has much to say. As he believes that even *Pithecanthropus* was a true man, he gives a long space to human history. ‘Over a million’ years is his first estimate. But immediately afterwards we find the heading: ‘Original or Primary Man—age 2,000,000 years.’ This higher age he afterwards adheres to.

Then as to the Pigmy. 'The Pigmy was the first Homo—the little red man of the Earth. From Africa these little men spread all over the world, North, East, South, and West, until not only Africa but Europe, Asia, North and South America, and Oceania were populated by them.' Later he gives the story of his 'evolution': 'The original Pigmy was "born" in Central Africa and spread throughout this world over a million years ago, and remnants of this first race are still found in the forests of Africa, in the forests of Bolivia, South America, in New Guinea, the New Hebrides, the mountains of China and the Philippine Islands (particularly the North Island of Luzan). With the Pigmy religion dawned, by the propitiation of Elementary Powers, propitiation of departed spirits and a belief in a Supreme Being. Theirs was the first articulate language; from the Pigmy, the human race has gradually developed in body and mind up to the present White Man, and the Christian doctrine, by evolution, from the various cults preceding it.'

It is all interesting, at times it is exciting. We never see quite clearly what are the proofs that the Pigmy was the first to escape from the brute, but the search itself is exciting. That the Pigmy has still some of the characteristics of the ape seems to be one fact in evidence, for Dr. Churchward quotes this from an article in the *Quarterly Review* for July 1901:

'These Pigmies easily fly into violent rages, very much after the style of apes and monkeys. They have a strong sense of humour and a great power of mimicry. Their mental abilities, though apparently so undeveloped in their natural lives, become considerable when brought out by kind treatment at the hands of Europeans, this producing a strange contrast with the apishness of their appearance and their actions. The pranks they play, half in malice and half in fun, on their full-grown neighbours, their remarkable power of concealing themselves rapidly in vegetation, reminds one over and over again of the descriptions of gnomes and elves in European legends. And, like the elves and gnomes of legends, the dwarf folk of Africa can be kindly to those whom they like, often performing some friendly little service unseen, or leaving some gift during the hours of darkness.'

The advocates of the drink trade in this country

lose no opportunity of asserting that prohibition in the United States of America is a failure. Their one trouble is to find a responsible American citizen who says so. Admiral Sims, for one, would have been so welcome. But what he said had to be hushed up. The surprise is the unanimity of the citizens of America. But we have to remember that it was a long battle. It goes back to Lincoln. In a book entitled *Lincoln and Prohibition* (Abingdon Press; \$2 net), Mr. Charles T. White, formerly Tax Commissioner of New York, has told fully the story of Lincoln's attitude and influence. We shall be satisfied with quoting one passage:

'President Lincoln's last utterance on temperance seems to have been to Chaplain Merwin on the early afternoon of the day he was assassinated.' 'As Merwin was leaving, the President said: "Merwin, with the help of the people, we have cleaned up a colossal job. Slavery is abolished. After reconstruction, the next great question will be the overthrow and abolition of the liquor traffic; and you know, Merwin, that my head and my heart and my hand and my purse will go into that work. Less than a quarter of a century ago I predicted that the time would come when there would be neither a slave nor a drunkard in the land. I have lived to see, thank God, one of those prophecies fulfilled. I hope to see the other realized."'

Dr. and Mrs. S. Herbert have translated Hans Fehlinger's *Sexual Life of Primitive People* into English (Black; 6s. net). It is a competent and condensed account of marriage and other sexual customs as disclosed in missionary and archaeological books and articles. It has been admirably translated.

The scholarly book on *Mithraism and Christianity* of the Rev. L. Patterson, M.A., Vice-Principal of Chichester Theological College (Cambridge: at the University Press; 6s. net) will surely do something to arrest the tendency, so persistently pushed at present, to make Christianity an ill-shaken mixture of Neo-platonism and the mystery religions. Mr. Patterson has studied Mithraism in itself and in relation to the New Testament. His conclusions are altogether adverse to the idea of any serious influence of that religion on Christianity.

The Meadville Theological School was founded for the training of Ministers for the Unitarian

Churches in the Western States of America. In June 1920, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the foundation was held. It was held with addresses, which were delivered by the Faculty and by others. Among the rest, by Professor J. B. Pratt of Williams College, who spoke on the History of Religions, and by Associate Professor G. R. Dodson of Washington University, who spoke on the Philosophy of Religion.

Professor Pratt defines religion: 'Religion is the attitude of individuals and societies toward the Power or Powers which they conceive as having ultimate control over their interests and destinies.' And then, having thus defined religion, he says that there are two wrong ways and one right way of studying religion. The first of the wrong ways he calls the Inspirational way. 'The Inspirational school is impatient of details, uses facts merely for illustration, is interested only in the "larger view," the "inner meaning," the "spiritual message," of the religion under study, and, having squeezed the juice quite easily from each of the great religions, throws the pulp aside and passes on with graceful stride to other sources of spiritual delight.' We recognize the method; but it is not much in favour now.

The second wrong way he calls the Factual way. The Factual school is at the antipodes of the Inspirational. 'It cares not for juice but only for pulp—and the drier the pulp the better. Its ideal is not that of spiritual delectation (which on the whole it rather scorns) but that of scholarly exactness and of objective truthfulness. Let values take care of themselves, it declares; what we want are the facts. And by the facts it usually means such things as the *minutiae* of some ancient cult or the superstition of some primitive tribe.'

Then the one right way 'is of course the attempt to retain what was best in both of the extreme methods and to avoid the limitations of each.' He calls this the Way of Scholarly Insight. Those who adopt this way 'insist that the facts of the world's religions must be gathered and studied with patient and scholarly care and exactness, but, though they regard all the facts as worthy of study, they do not regard them all as of equal value. And the most important of the facts, the most worthy of scholarly examination, they consider to be the fundamental meanings, the ultimate conceptions, the moral ideals and incentives, the emotional reinforcements, which the various great

religions have contributed to the spiritual life of their members.'

The volume has the title of *Theological Study To-day*. It is published at the University of Chicago Press (\$1.50 net), of which the representative in Great Britain is the Cambridge University Press.

So few are the sermon volumes now published that *The Christian World Pulpit* has the opportunity of its existence. And without doubt or denial it is meeting its opportunity. In the volume last issued—it is the 99th and contains the weekly numbers from January to June 1921 (7s. 6d. net)—every Church is represented, and every variety of orthodoxy is represented also—Canon Adderley at the one end, Archdeacon Charles at the other. Some of the celebrated sermons of the time are in the volume. Here is Bishop Gore's sermon on the Fall, Dr. Clifford's anniversary sermon on Making Disciples, Archbishop Söderblom's Conference Sermon on Unity, Dr. Sclater's London Missionary Society's Annual Sermon on the Providence of God. Dr. Sclater's text is Ps 23³, 'He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.' He begins: 'Some time ago I happened to be at a funeral service which one of the most distinguished ministers of the Church from which I come was conducting. In the course of his prayer he began to quote this psalm, and this is what he said: "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths that lead straight home for His name's sake."' Then he says that 'that translation is just about as accurate a rendering of the real meaning of the poet as any translation could be.'

Add to the sermons and the index of texts—Eph 3¹⁷⁻¹⁹, p. 244; Mt 28¹⁹, p. 61. For one sermon a text is quoted, but it has nothing to do with the sermon or the sermon with it. The sermon is by Mr. Richard Roberts. The text quoted is Eph 4¹³, 'Till we all come in the unity of the faith.' But the sermon is on Eph 4¹⁵, 'Speaking the truth in love.'

Mr. Edmond Holmes has faith in education. He says *Give Me the Young* (Constable; 6s. net)—

that he may educate them. If he can educate them in his own way, he is sure that the dawning of the day and the fleeing away of the shadows will not be far off. What is his way? It is, for short, the way of Professor Cizek. He says: 'One of the most successful of pioneers is Professor Cizek, the Viennese Art Master, the work of whose pupils—children of from six to fourteen years of age—has recently been exhibited in London and at other centres and has surprised and delighted all who have seen it. "How do you do it?" asked an interviewer, when she had looked at some hundreds of the productions of the professor's pupils; "each more delightful and original than the last." "But I don't do it," he answered. "I take the lid off, and other art masters clap it on. That is the only difference." "The only difference!" Yes, but this only difference is very nearly the whole difference between the right and the wrong method of education.'

A little earlier in the book he says this:

'Dr. Temple, Bishop of Manchester, and ex-Head Master of Repton, in a presidential address to the Teachers' Guild, told his audience that "a new-born child has practically no will," and that "the elementary stages of education consist in creating will, the faculty of attention, which is of the essence of will." This is a fair sample of the erroneous psychology—the outcome of profound ignorance of child nature, especially in its earlier stages—on which education of the repressive type is based. If Dr. Temple had ever studied the ways and works of an infant during the first year or two of its life, he would have realized that, far from having "no will," "the new-born child" is brimming over with will-power, and that its main purpose, in exercising its will, is to educate itself.'

His way is to let the child educate himself.

The Rev. William L. Stidger fills his church to overflowing every Sunday. There is *Standing Room Only*. And under that title he writes a book to show all other ministers how they may fill their churches (Doran; \$2 net). He fills his church himself. He sets about it unblushingly, openly, triumphantly. He advertises his church. For one thing he plants an illuminated cross on the highest pinnacle of his church, a cross that, like the sword in Paradise, turns every way, not to ward off, but to entice the worshipper to enter.

And when he puts up the cross he plasters a bill on the church board:

DO NOT BE STARTLED!
AT THE LIGHT
IN THE SKY
SUNDAY!

IT IS NOT A COMET!
IT IS NOT A SHOOTING STAR!
IT IS NOT AN AIRPLANE!

IT IS THE FIRST REVOLVING CROSS
EVER ERECTED ON A CHURCH
IN THE WORLD!

IT IS
ON CALVARY METHODIST CHURCH
Corner of Judah and 19th

You are invited to the dedication of this cross by
'The Church with First Revolving Cross'
WM. L. STIDGER, Pastor.

A volume has been issued from the Epworth Press on *The Manner of the Master and Studies in His Teaching* (3s. net). The author, the Rev. Alfred H. Lowe, B.D., says of it: 'The present volume seeks to arrange the teaching of Jesus in definite and compact groups, so as to convey an impression of its character and scope. But only the leading topics are dealt with. The work is the result of many years' reading and study, and takes account of the modern method and attitude in relation to New Testament study.'

Thus the book has its definite place and purpose. It fills its place and fulfils its purpose. Two passages will be found quoted on another page.

The *Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Dante Society* (Cambridge, Mass.) contains a paper by Mr. Paget Toynbee on 'Dante in English Art' (Ginn & Company). It is a fine thing in scholarship as well as in art. The great feature is a Chronological Record of Representations by English Artists, with notes. But there are four valuable indexes besides—an alphabetical index of artists with date of their first work, an index of subjects, an index of passages illustrated, and an

index of Exhibitions and Galleries, with the years in which Dante subjects were exhibited, and the names of the artists.

In support of the movement for the encouragement of the study of our own times, in school and out of it, two educational reformers, Mr. Morris Edmund Speare and Mr. Walter Blake Norris, have issued a handbook containing extracts from recent writers on *Vital Forces in Current Events* (Ginn; 5s. 6d. net). It is a book for the American pupil first. The atmosphere is American and the writers are mostly American. But the last lecture, on 'Understanding Other Nations,' has quotations from Mr. John Galsworthy on 'Diagnosis of the Englishman,' from Professor Gilbert Murray on 'Aristocracy in English Life,' and similar quotations from Maurice Barrès and Émile Boutroux on France, from William Kay Wallace on Italy, from Moissaye J. Olgin on Russia, and from J. O. P. Bland on the Far-Eastern Problem. Some of the passages are worth committing to memory word for word.

There are few things more puzzling than the genesis of style. Last month we noticed a book by Dr. Alexander Irvine and compared it with the work of Barrie. In style it is certainly not inferior to Barrie at his best. Where did Irvine pick it up? He was born and (un)educated in the ragged atmosphere of an Irish village. Or turn to Lafcadio Hearn. The step is a long one from Ulster to Japan. But the two writers are one in this that both have an entrancing gift of language, and in this also that no one can discover how they made themselves master of it. Is style the one unmerited gift of God? Is it the writer of idiomatic English who is truly born, not made?

Read the new volume of stories and essays by Lafcadio Hearn called *Karma* which Messrs. Harrap have published (5s. net). It is a most agreeable volume to have and handle. Read any of the stories or essays—that on the ghost—a ghost we all encounter every day, or that on the Boy who drew Cats, or that on Karma, the best of all.

A few years ago there were published almost simultaneously (as is the way with books) some four or five short histories of Israel—Ottley's, Wade's, Whitham's, occur to memory at once—

and of these, *The Biblical History of the Hebrews*, by Professor F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., arrested attention by its scholarship and its style. The book has done well, but no better than it deserved. Now it appears in a fourth edition, with the notes revised and two new chapters added, bringing the history up to the New Testament times (Cambridge: Heffer; 10s. net).

Let no one say that present-day preaching is ancient and individual. The twenty-first Hartley Lecture, delivered by the Rev. H. J. Taylor before the Primitive Methodist Church in Conference, was modern and social. It was even secular, if the distinction is insisted on. Mr. Taylor was not troubled about that. What troubles him is the state of modern society. That deplorable state is due, he believes, to the want of freedom (or its abuse). And he boldly took for the subject of his lecture *The Challenge of Freedom* (Holborn Publishing House; 5s. net).

He shirked nothing. Liberty in politics is as dear to him as liberty in Christ. They are in truth inseparable. And he faced the problem of conscription as courageously as any other.

In *Labrador Days* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) Dr. W. T. Grenfell has sent out, in good time for the long winter evenings, a book of short stories. They have the merit of being true, though doubtless they lose nothing in the telling. They have further the charm of the unfamiliar. Those hardy and hard-up Labrador fishermen have not yet been exploited by the fiction furnisher. And with all these advantages there is this advantage also, that every story makes for God and good.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have now published the lectures which Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale delivered at Manchester College, Oxford, last winter. The title is *Jesus and Paul* (10s. 6d. net).

Dr. Bacon holds that the Christian era should begin with the 25th of December, 165 B.C. For on that day the worship of Jehovah was restored in the temple at Jerusalem. The heroic sons of Mattathias, who had won back both religious freedom and national independence, founded a native dynasty of priest kings, and with the beginning of the new epoch religion too advanced with rapid strides.

Jesus fell into the pace. He invented no new

religion; He simply gave impetus to the development of the religion that He inherited. During His own lifetime He made progress. Then Paul took up the succession. It is quite a mistake to talk of 'Back to Christ.' To go back to Christ is to go from an advanced stage of religious progress to a less advanced. Paul simply made universal what hitherto had been national. He made it universal by making it personal. His most characteristic utterance is 'who loved me, and gave himself for me.' Individualization is universalization.

Professor Bacon rejects all the theories about the origin of Christianity which have sprung up like mushrooms in our time. Will his own theory outlive them? It is suspiciously like the notion that Jesus is one and Christ another, to which the Hibbert trustees generously gave rope enough wherewith to hang itself some years ago. But he has his peculiarity. With the mystery religions he will have nothing to do—or next to nothing. Paul studied Isaiah. If his Christ was not Jesus, it was the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, certainly no Mithraic monster. But—'the Christ whom Paul preaches is great only as the agent of God, and Paul asks no more for himself than to be accepted as the dedicated agent of this agent.' And that is the Paul who said, 'To me to live is Christ.'

One thing Professor Bacon sees and makes visible to others: the gospel of Jesus and the gospel of Paul is a gospel of reconciliation.

The Essex Hall Lecture for 1921 was delivered by L. P. Jacks, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. Its title as published is *The Lost Radiance of the Christian Religion* (Lindsey Press; 1s. 3d. net). The title is in touch with the times, and the lecture will be read with enjoyment. Dr. Jacks has a fine gift of expression. And his idea is true. It is both Pauline and Petrine. But it is not all the truth. There is a depth as well as a height. There is tribulation as well as triumph.

The Rev. James Sibree, D.D., F.R.G.S., is an authority on Madagascar. He well may be. For he has spent fifty-one years on the island, and his eyes have been open all the time. *Things Seen in Madagascar* by him is just what we go to him for. He describes them sympathetically, and he illustrates what he describes. It is an interesting place.

There are interesting people in it, and yet more interesting animals. By boys and girls of inquiring minds the book will be devoured. It is published by the Livingstone Press of the L.M.S. (2s. 6d. net).

The third volume of the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures has been published. It contains *St. Paul's Epistles to the Churches* (Longmans; 8s. 6d. net).

The Notes are short, and mostly meant to account for the translation. The translation is the thing. It is done from the Vulgate, of course, but with constant and competent reference to the Greek text. And the most modern as well as the most Protestant translations are consulted. Thus the translators of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans follow Dr. Moffatt (or at any rate agree with him) in placing Ro 2¹⁶ before 2^{14, 15}. Here is the translation of the whole paragraph (Ro 2¹²⁻¹⁵):

'Such then as have sinned not being under the Law, will perish without reference to the Law; and such as have sinned under the Law, will be punished with reference to the Law. For it is not the hearers of the Law that are just in God's sight, but it is the doers of the Law that will be justified, in the day on which, as my gospel teacheth, God will judge the secrets of men through Christ Jesus. For when the gentiles, who by nature have not the Law, fulfil the requirements of the Law, these, though they have not the Law, are a law unto themselves, showing as they do the demands of the Law to be written in their hearts; and an approving conscience beareth them out, amid the debate of thoughts that accuse or defend.'

It is a strange providence that led the editors of three totally distinct series of commentaries to give them the name of Westminster. The distinction is by Church organization—Dr. Garvie's is Free Church, Dr. Lock's is Anglican, this Roman. The editors of this series are the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., and the Rev. Joseph Keating, S.J.

Messrs. Luzac have published the first volume of 'The Eothen Series.' 'The object of this series is to publish original texts and translations, transliterations and translations of texts hitherto unpublished in English, and essays on the history, civilisation, religion, etc., of Western Asia in the earliest times.' This first volume is on *The Early*

Dynasties of Sumer and Akkad. The author, Mr. C. J. Gadd, B.A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, has made the little book indispensable to the student of Assyriology—just what it was his duty to do.

The *Service Book and Ordinal of the Presbyterian Church of South Africa* is published in Glasgow by Messrs. Maclehose, Jackson & Co. (6s. net). The work of the Rev. E. Macmillan, M.A., of Pretoria, it is issued by authority of the Church. And it is not easy to say which deserves the greater praise, the man who compiled the book or the Church which accepted and issued it. Certainly it should not be overlooked by any young minister. It is not at all likely to be overlooked by those who are interested in liturgies.

In the eighty-fifth year of his age Dr. Lyman Abbott has published a book with the title of *What Christianity Means to Me* (Macmillan; \$1.75), and it has none of the marks by which we know that old age comes not alone. It has neither flippancy nor fatuity, neither the pretence of youthful vigour nor the inconsequence of a worn-out brain. It is simply the work of a man of sound mind enriched by manifold experience. And that experience is Christian experience. His belief (he will not allow us to say creed) may not be wholly ours, but it is the belief of a follower of Christ who has been repenting all through his life and been bringing forth fruits worthy of repentance. Let us hear his own confession. Near the end he condenses his message into a few sentences:—

‘Christianity means to me:

‘A new spirit of love, service, and sacrifice in humanity.

‘A new and ever developing life in art, literature, music, philosophy, government, industry, worship.

‘A relief from the heavy burden of remorse for past errors, blunders, and sins.

‘An ever growing aspiration for the future and an ever increasing power toward achievement.

‘Faith in ourselves and in our fellow men; in our infinite possibilities because in our infinite inheritance.

‘Faith in the great enterprise in which God’s loyal children are engaged, that of making a new world out of this old world, a faith which failure does not discourage nor death destroy.

‘Faith in a Leader who both sets us our task and shares it with us; the longer we follow him and work with him, the more worthy to be loved, trusted, and followed does he seem to us to be.

‘Faith in a companionable God whom we cannot understand, still less define, but with whom we can be acquainted, as a little child is acquainted with his mysterious mother.

‘Faith in our present possession of a deathless life of the spirit, which we share with the Father of our spirits and our divinely appreciated leader.’

One merit which the books of Professor J. Arthur Thomson possess is that they raise questions. His new book, *The Control of Life* (Melrose; 7s. 6d. net), raises questions nearly on every page. In this respect, at any rate, his books are to be called great. For it is the great books of the world that raise most questions. The greatest book of all raises most of all.

And why do his books raise questions? Because they are in touch with the Universe and with life on earth. The Universe is for ever teaching us to say Why? Life is for ever teaching. Professor Thomson writes most interestingly of the things in the Universe and in our daily life, but rarely to answer the questions already raised, nearly always to raise more. He will have no dogmatics. His own dogma—‘Science is for Life, not Life for Science’—is the obliteration of all dogmatic limits to thought, as to investigation. He believes, as all men of science if not all scientists believe, that the Universe and our life will stand investigation. There is purpose and the progress of purpose. Infinite detail is dangerous to belief, but he can occupy himself with the most minute, complex, perplexing details of life on the earth and keep his head above the waters of unbelief.

One of the questions raised is that of the transmission of acquired characters. See ‘Entre Nous’ for a quotation.

The articles and reviews in the *Times Literary Supplement* are unsigned. But now and then their authorship is revealed. With what result? To weaken their authority? To lessen their interest? Not, surely, when the author is discovered to be Mr. A. Clutton-Brock. For Mr. Clutton-Brock has taken hold of the imagination of his countrymen—the literary and theological among his countrymen—as few of his fellow-writers have

done. He has published another volume of his contributions to the Supplement—*More Essays on Books* (Methuen; 6s. net).

Here is the sympathetic essay on Walt Whitman, the salutary essay on George Herbert, the two surprise essays on George Meredith. Here also is the notice of Wells's *God the Invisible King* (more serious than the subject demanded), and the delightfully easy and instructive review of recent Light and Humorous Verse. And here is much more, all worth reading again and retaining.

Mr. Henry J. Cadbury, Lecturer on the New Testament in Andover Theological Seminary, has now completed and published the second part of his book on *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. The first part discussed the Diction of Luke and Acts. The second part discusses *The Treatment of Sources in the Gospel* (Humphrey Milford; 7s. 6d. net).

In one section Mr. Cadbury considers whether certain changes made by Luke on Mark may be due to religious motives. There he notes a fact, often overlooked, that Luke's references to crowds are less frequent than Mark's. He thinks that may be due to reverence for Jesus. He would not like to think that the crowds inconsiderately caused Him inconvenience. He does not notice, however, that *sympathetic* references to multitudes are quite a feature of Luke's Gospel. To what is that due?

Professor Samuel A. B. Mercer, D.D., has himself written the volume on *The Life and Growth of Israel* for his Biblical and Oriental series (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; \$1 net).

It is no conventional Old Testament History. The titles of the chapters are: '(1) The Rock whence they were Hewn, (2) The Infancy of Israel, (3) The Childhood of Israel, (4) Israel's Youth, (5) Israel's Coming of Age, (6) Israel's Maturity, (7) Israel's Ripened Maturity, (8) Israel's Residuary Gifts.'

Here is evolution in most agreeable and instructive application. If the book is for teachers, it is surprisingly readable.

To their popular series entitled 'Every Christian's Library,' Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have added a volume on *The Tabernacle's Typical Teaching*, by Algernon J. Pollock (2s. 6d. net).

Mr. Henry Pickering, editor of *The Witness* and author of many volumes of evangelical devotion, has collected 'a series of brief records of Brethren Beloved.' The title is *Chief Men among the Brethren* (Pickering & Inglis; 3s. 6d. net). There are sixty-four names, and there is a portrait and biographical sketch of every one of them.

Stories of birds and beasts are unsurpassable in the eyes of the little ones, if they are well told and well illustrated. The Religious Tract Society makes a specialty of them. And Captain Oliver G. Pike's *Birdland Stories* (6s. net) are a specialty among specialties. The illustrations are his own. They too are very charming.

Messrs. Scribner have begun the issue of a new series of handbooks for the use of teachers of religion. The title is 'Life and Religion Series.' The first volume has been written by Professor F. K. Sanders, Ph.D., D.D., of Yale. It is surely the most difficult volume that the series will contain. For it covers the whole subject of *Old Testament Prophecy* (\$1.25). It may be the most successful. Professor Sanders has this gift by nature, and he has perfected it by long and arduous discipline. The short chapter of bibliography is itself a masterpiece.

Another effort has been made to write *Prayers for Day and Sunday Schools and Children's Services* (S.P.C.K.; 9d.). Oh, how difficult it is! But try this.

If the Bible is the religion of Protestantism, the Quakers are not Protestants. Their attitude is always sympathetic, but always critical. Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., is an excellent example. There is no bibliolatry in his book on *The Bible: Its Nature and Inspiration* (Swarthmore Press; 2s. 6d. net), but there is insight and enlightenment.

Christ and Caesar is the title of a long, earnest, able argument on behalf of conscience and against conscription. There are two authors, Nathaniel Micklem, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Theology at the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, and Herbert Morgan, M.A., Director of Extra-Mural Studies, University College of Wales, Aberystwyth (Swarthmore Press; 6s. 6d. net).

The difficulty of difficulties is reached at the very end. 'How is it possible in practice to discriminate between what may be called the "redemptive restraint" of the police and the violence of war? Incidents like the late struggle in Sidney Street may at any time arise. It may seem the best thing that a group of lawless criminals should be arrested; the police come to arrest them; they resist, barricade themselves in a house and threaten all comers with fire-arms. What is there for it but that the house be stormed? What is to be the attitude here of a man who says he can justify police action, but not war?

'This seems to us the hardest problem which we have to meet, and we are anxious not to shirk the difficulty even though our solution is not wholly satisfactory. We have argued that evil can only be overcome with good, hate with love, and that persons are to be treated not in the mass but as brothers and individuals; we believe that under

certain circumstances coercion may be used upon persons with a view to their redemption from the evil will. But how are these principles to be applied in these hard cases? It might perhaps be said that these situations only arise because in the past the Christian way has not been taken, and therefore there comes a point when the Christian must leave to others the clearing up of a situation for which he is in no way responsible. This might be fair; and yet it would be tantamount to the admission that the way of Christ is not adequate for every human situation. It may be fairly urged that there is no need to storm the house in Sidney Street; let the ruffians be isolated, and let them be fed; let the maximum of moral pressure be used upon them, and let there be left no possibility of doubt but that forgiveness and restoration await their willingness to take once more their proper and due place in society. This seems to us the Christian way.'

The Relay Race.

By PROFESSOR WILFRID J. MOULTON, B.D., DIDSBURY COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

THE opening verses of Heb. 12 carry forward the stirring appeal of the great chapter on the heroes of faith. The men and women whose names are written there risked and dared everything because they believed in the certainty of God's rule, and lived and died to bring in His Kingdom. Now the writer, turning to his readers and bidding them to be worthy of their glorious past, suddenly brings in a new figure. They are all running in a race: a race that calls for the expenditure of every ounce of strength and skill and perseverance, and which means the stripping off of all superfluous weight. What sort of a race is it? Exposition in general treats it as being such a race as Paul refers to in 1 Co 9^{24f.}, the foot-race, where many run but there is only one winner. Yet this explanation does not do justice to the present passage. This is a race in which it is to be noted—(a) That no one has yet received the prize, cf. 11^{39, 40}. It seems that the prize distribution will not take place till the last man is home. (b) The crowd of those who have already run is continually growing. Some writers seem to obscure this because they are so

anxious to point out the obvious truth that 'witness' does not mean, as in English, 'spectator,' as well as one who has borne his witness. The ambiguity of the English word has led some of the unlearned to find spectators in the witnesses. But possibly also it has led some of the learned to miss the fact that the spectators are really there, not in the word 'witnesses,' but in the word 'cloud.' The cloud is the dense crowd of those whose part in the race is over but who are waiting for the finish before they can receive their reward.

If, now, we ask whether we know any race that fulfils these conditions, any one who has been to a modern athletic meeting can supply the answer. It is, of course, the Relay Race. One man sets out carrying the flag and runs till he gives it into the hands of the next man of his side in front of him, and so on. As the race goes on there is an increasing crowd of those who have run already cheering on the later runners. No matter how brilliantly the earlier runners have done, they cannot win till the last man of their side is in.

Is it an anachronism to see such a race in

Hebrews? We find the answer in considering the ancient Torch-Race or Lampadedromia. There were various forms of this at different times. The one that Pausanias describes was made up of a number of runners, each bearing a lighted torch. The first that reached the goal with his torch alight was the winner. Behind the torch-bearers started a number of young men without torches. Any one of these who caught up one of the torch-bearers took his torch from him and carried it forwards. Regarded as a sport, this is a glorified hare and hounds, where the first hound that catches one of the hares becomes a hare himself. This is a novelty which none of our modern colleges seem to have tried. But there was another Torch-Race which is very clearly described by Dr. Liddell in *Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, ed. 3, vol. ii. 5b. He says: 'We are clearly to understand lines of runners, posted at intervals, the first in each line who receives the torch, or takes it from the altar, running at his best speed and handing it to the second in his own line, and the second to the third, until the last in the line is reached, who runs with it to the appointed spot. Of course, if any torch went out, the line to which it belonged was out of the race. The victory fell to that line of runners whose torch first reached the goal alight.' May we not claim that some such race was in the mind of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews?

The stimulus of such an appeal is plain whether the first readers of the Epistle were Jewish or Gentile Christians. If they were Jews, reproached with lack of patriotism because they would not throw in their lot with their nation in the last great conflict with Rome, they were strengthened by the thought that all that was best and purest in the history and traditions of their own people was inalienably theirs. It was they and not those who

were mustering against Rome who were truly carrying on the torch which had been kindled in the distant past. It was through them, and them alone, that the victory for which Abraham and Moses and the rest of the worthies strove could be achieved. If they were Gentiles, reproached with turning aside from the culture and progressive thought of the time, the stimulus was almost as great. Small and despised as their groups of fellow-Christians might appear, they were yet links in a great succession that began with the dawn of history and would not end till Christ's victory was complete. Moreover, the greatness of the privilege brought a weight of responsibility. If they failed or grew weary the victory of the whole goodly company would be endangered. It is a thought which has obvious applications to the present. It is a temptation to many to speak of the Church as a back-number, and to seek elsewhere for the forces of progress and reconstruction. Yet, whatever our limitations may be, the living Church of Christ is carrying forward the work of those who set out to establish God's Kingdom on earth. It is not for us to let down those who went before us, but rather, with courage and persistence, to fulfil our part of effort and of service, with our eyes fixed, not on our own success, but on the victory of the whole.

Like Wordsworth's Happy Warrior, the runner in this race is:

The Man, who, lifted high,
Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
Or left unthought-of in obscurity,—
Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not—
Plays, in the many games of life, that one
Where what he most doth value must be won.

When he asks what must be valued most, there is but one answer, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God.'

The Rearrangement of John vii. and viii.

BY THE REVEREND G. H. C. MACGREGOR, B.A.(CAMB.), BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

I. THE more obvious cases of dislocation in the text of the Fourth Gospel are now generally accepted, but surprisingly little attention is still given to others. True, one suspects that much

superfluous ingenuity has been expended in 'discovering' dislocation, in order that scope may be obtained for even greater ingenuity in reconstruction. But the scepticism caused by ingenuity run

wild must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the text is much more seriously disarranged than is generally recognized. The very fact that we find a critic as early as Tatian groping after a reconstructed order, and sometimes even forestalling modern conclusions, should go far to prove that these dislocations are not only 'apparent' but real. Did the dislocations exist only in the subtle imagination of a Spitta, the improvement in sequence and consistency brought about by transposition could not possibly be so marked as in fact it is; confusion would but be made worse confounded. The rearrangement of the text has so important a bearing upon the problems of the Gospel, e.g. its relation to the Synoptics and the chronology of the Life of Christ, that it deserves to be regarded as an essential preliminary to the study of the Gospel as a whole.

2. Much attention has been given to chapters 7 and 8; the following conclusions may be regarded as accepted and call for no discussion:

(a) Chapter 5 has fallen out from before 7, the original order being 6, 5, 7.

(b) 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ should follow immediately after 5⁴⁷, 7¹⁻¹⁴ plus 7^{25ff.} forming a continuous section.

(c) 7⁵⁸⁻⁸¹, the Pericope de adultera, is a later addition with no place in the original Gospel.

The usually accepted order (omitting for the moment 8¹²⁻²⁰) is thus: 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, 1-14, 25-52, 8^{21ff.}

3. What, then, is the correct position of 8¹²⁻²⁰? Two alternatives seem possible:

(a) Burton would place it outside the chapters under discussion after 10²¹ (10¹⁹⁻²¹ being transposed to follow immediately after 9⁴¹). This setting appears good, Jesus' proclamation of Himself as the Light of the world following most appropriately after the healing of the man born blind, the Pharisees' question, 'Are we blind also?' (9⁴⁰), and the question of 'others,' 'Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?' (10²¹). 8²⁰ will then be an echo of 9⁵. We may note that chapter 10 already shows many signs of disarrangement, so that 8¹²⁻²⁰ might well have fallen out. Burton would rearrange 10¹⁹⁻²¹ 8¹²⁻²⁰ 10²²⁻²⁹, 1-18, 30ff.

(b) Others (cf. F. Warburton Lewis, *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 17 ff.) would insert 8¹²⁻²⁰ after 7²⁴ (omitting the words, 'then spake Jesus again unto them, saying,' as a link put in later), 7¹⁻¹⁴ following. Though at first sight the connexion does not appear so clear as that suggested by Burton, closer examination shows it

to be even more appropriate. 7²⁴ standing by itself would form a very abrupt conclusion, the transition thence to 7¹ being sudden and harsh. Insert 8¹²⁻²⁰ at this point, and we find that v.²⁰ forms an admirable conclusion to the incidents in Jerusalem during Pentecost narrated in chapters 5 and 7¹⁵⁻²⁴. Jesus finding Himself in an atmosphere of hostility, which, however, has not yet developed into open violence (8²⁰), withdraws to Galilee (7¹). Moreover, the thought of 8¹²⁻²⁰ rounds off that of 7¹⁵⁻²⁰ and contains numerous echoes of chapter 5. The thought of 'witnessing' (5³¹⁻³⁹ 7¹⁸ 8¹²⁻¹⁴, 17-18) and of the resultant verdict (5⁴⁰⁻⁴⁷ 7¹⁷, 24 8¹⁵, 19) runs through all three passages. Testimony is borne to Jesus both by His Father and by His own works (5³²⁻³⁷); but His opponents cannot appreciate the testimony because their powers of judgment are distorted (5⁴²⁻⁴⁴); yet the man who brings this warped mind into line with God's will can get true insight (7¹⁷); so Jesus pleads with His opponents not to allow their judgment on things spiritual to be biased by their external prejudices, i.e. formal Sabbath observance, etc. (7²⁴). Note now the connexion at 8¹²: if only they will look to Christ they will find Him 'the light of the world,' needing no external testimony (cf. 5³⁴), but self-evidencing in a far truer sense than John, whose light they did recognize (5³⁵), and able to lead them into true judgments (8^{12b}). Note, too, that 8¹⁵, 'Ye judge after the flesh, I judge no man,' takes up exactly 7²⁴, 'Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgement'; and in 8¹⁶, 19 we have echoes of 5³⁰ and 5³⁷, 38 respectively.

We will rearrange therefore: 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ 8¹²⁻²⁰ 7¹⁻¹⁴ 7^{25ff.}

4. Omitting the Pericope de adultera, is 8^{21ff.} now in correct position immediately after 7⁵²? Spitta would assume that a passage has been omitted at 7⁵², its place being filled up by the Pericope de adultera; but there is no trace of any such section. Others have held (e.g. Lewis, *op. cit.* 22) that no gap need be assumed, and that the transition from 7⁵² to 8²¹ is quite satisfactory. From this one must emphatically dissent. Jesus cannot possibly be thought of as present at the private inquiry of the chief priests and Pharisees, including Nicodemus, into the failure of 'the officers' to arrest Him. Yet at 8²¹ He is suddenly introduced as renewing to this audience a discourse exactly similar to that broken off at 7³⁶, and this in spite of the fact that v.³⁷, marking the transition to a different occasion altogether, has intervened.

We suggest, therefore, that 8^{21ff.} should be inserted at 7³⁶, noting the following points:

(a) 8²¹ admittedly resumes the argument of 7³⁴, 'Then said Jesus *again* unto them.' With the text as it stands the question of the Jews in 7^{35, 36} is left in the air. Now, is this after the evangelist's manner? On the contrary, we note that elsewhere in the Gospel such questions, provoked by some difficult saying of Jesus, are asked only to prepare the way immediately for a second declaration by Him. We may compare 13^{35ff.}, 'Whither I go, ye cannot come' . . . 'Lord, whither goest thou?' . . . 'Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards.' Or compare again 16^{16ff.}, 'A little while, and ye shall not see me,' . . . 'What is this that He saith unto us, A little while . . .?' . . . 'Jesus . . . said unto them, Do ye inquire . . .? . . . Verily I say unto you . . .'. Accordingly, after the question of 7^{35, 36}, we expect an immediate rejoinder from Jesus, and this we find in 8²¹.

(b) The passage to be transposed would end at 8⁵⁹; the disorder in the text at that verse suggests that a dislocation may have taken place at this point.

5. Once 8²¹⁻⁵⁹ is inserted before 7³⁷ one more transposition makes the sequence of the two chapters under consideration perfect. Transpose 7⁴⁵⁻⁵² before 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴ (as Burton suggests), so that v. ⁴⁵ follows immediately on 8⁵⁹. How perfectly natural the train of events! As the text stands at present the officers are sent to arrest Jesus at 7³², and it is not till a new day has dawned at v. ³⁷ that they report to their masters at v. ⁴⁵. With the suggested re-arrangement, at 7³² the officers are sent to arrest Jesus, at 8⁵⁹ they allow Jesus to escape, and in the very next verse, 7⁴⁵, they are called to account for their remissness; moreover, these events can now take place during the course of a single day.

We are now left with 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴ as an impressive climax to the whole section dealing with Jesus' visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles. This, as so often in this Gospel, concludes with a summing up of the impression left by Jesus on the people (7^{43, 44}). Parallels may be found in 6^{66ff.} summing up the results of the early Galilean ministry, and 10^{19ff.} noting the impression left by the healing of the man born blind.

The final order of the two chapters will thus stand: 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ 8¹²⁻²⁰ 7¹⁻¹⁴ 25-36 8²¹⁻⁵⁹ 7⁴⁵⁻⁵² 37-44.

6. Can we suggest how these sections, originally

arranged thus, have fallen into their present order? Spitta's theory that the pages of a papyrus roll (each page unit containing about 18½ lines of Westcott and Hort's small Greek text) had got out of order is at least striking; and though one feels that the hypothesis of accidental disarrangement is rather unsatisfactory and certainly incapable of covering every dislocation, and also that Spitta's theory is almost too ingenious to be true, still when it is applied to chapters 7-8 the results are certainly arresting. The following remarks are put forward with some diffidence, for one is conscious that the whole theory is a precarious one on which to work, but they may be of interest to those to whom Spitta's theory appeals, and it may at least be pleaded that the following investigation appears to corroborate the results already arrived at by less precarious methods.

We will take as the page unit of our hypothetical papyrus roll Lewis' modification of Spitta's 'key,' say about 9.5 lines (Lewis takes 9.3) of W.H. small text, remembering always that a certain amount of latitude must be allowed, for even in the most carefully written MS. there would be greater difference between the contents of the pages than in a printed book.

We have noted that chapters 7-8 fall into five sections, which appear to have suffered disarrangement *en bloc*, as follows:

- A. 7¹⁵⁻²⁴.
- B. 8¹²⁻²⁰.
- C. 7¹⁻¹⁴ plus 7²⁵⁻³⁶.
- D. 8²¹⁻⁵⁹.
- E. 7⁴⁵⁻⁵² plus 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴.

In addition we have the Pericope de adultera 7⁵³⁻⁸¹, which we may term F.

Spitta has shown (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur d. Urchristentums*, p. 197) that a page of the roll ends with chapter 7. More important for the moment is Lewis' similar proof (*op. cit.* 15) that a page would end with chapter 5, *i.e.* the material of chapter 7 would begin at the top of a page, just as it ends at the foot of one. It will be seen later that the same is true of chapter 8. The whole section, chapters 7-8, thus falls within a series of complete pages, and so may be dealt with as a unit by itself. Again, it has already been observed by the same scholars that sections A, B, and F are multiples of the page unit filling complete pages

and therefore capable of being transposed *en bloc*. We have then the following results:

A contains $18\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills 2 pages;

B contains $18\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills 2 pages;

F contains $18\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills 2 pages;

But so far as I am aware it has not previously been observed that:

(a) C contains $47\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills exactly 5 pages. This is important, as it makes a page end at 7^{86} , and therefore makes possible our proposed insertion of 8^{21-59} at that point.

(b) D, allowing for gaps in type, etc., contains 77 lines, as nearly as possible filling 8 page units, once again allowing a break at 8^{59} , where we propose to insert section E.

(c) E contains 27–28 lines, and would fill 3 pages. We now have this remarkable result: A fills 2 pages, B 2 pages, C 5 pages, D 8 pages, E 3 pages, F 2 pages. May it not be something more than mere coincidence that each of our six sections begins and ends with a page and is therefore capable of being transposed *en bloc*, exactly what appears to have happened?

7. To develop the theory further in order to suggest how the present order of the text may have been arrived at is of course pure guess-work, but the following is put forward as a possible hypothesis.

(a) Section C (5 pages) may have fallen out. The gap left was then filled up—

(i.) By transferring section E (3 pages) to stand where C began, that is, immediately after 8^{20} . We may note that there is a superficially appropriate transition from 8^{20} ('no man laid hands on him, for his hour was not yet come') to the question in 7^{45} , the first verse of E, which would now follow immediately ('Why have ye not brought him?'). This apparent connexion would help the insertion of E at this point.

(ii.) The additional gap of 2 pages was filled by inserting section F, the Pericope de adultera, from an external source.

(b) Subsequently section B fell out and was placed between section F and section D. This position would perhaps be chosen because of the apparent link backwards with F (the story of Jesus and the adulteress being regarded as an illustration of the saying in 8^{15} , 'Ye judge after the flesh, I judge no man'), and forwards with D (8^{14} , 'Ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go,'

appearing to look forward to 8^{21} , 'whither I go, ye cannot come').

(c) Finally, section C, now floating loose out of its original position, was attached at the beginning of the whole series of sections.

The resultant order would then be as follows: C (7^{1-14} plus 7^{25-36}), A (7^{15-24}), E (7^{45-52} plus 7^{37-44}), F (7^{53-81}), B (8^{12-20}), D (8^{21-59}).

8. Thus the present order of the text is reached, except that we still have to explain (a) why section A (7^{15-24}) now stands in the middle of section C, and (b) why, in section E, 7^{37-44} now stands before 7^{45-52} . As neither the divided portions of C (7^{1-14} , $25-36$) nor the interchanged portions of E (7^{37-44} , $45-52$) are multiples of the page unit and so liable to accidental dislocation, the transpositions here must be explained otherwise than by Spitta's theory.

(a) 7^{15-24} . After the accidental dislocations suggested in paragraph 7 above had taken place, the position of 7^{15-24} , then lying between 7^{36} and 7^{45} , would be impossible, the transition both at the beginning and at the end of the passage showing no sequence of thought. A subsequent copyist on the look out for a better position may have inserted it after 7^{14} , having noticed the apparent connexion between Jesus' teaching in v^{14} and the Jews' 'marvelling' at his 'letters' in v^{15} .

(b) 7^{45-52} plus 7^{37-44} . Once v^{45} is by the previous dislocation taken out of connexion with 8^{59} , the motive for the question in v^{45} is lost. The officers have been sent to arrest Jesus at 7^{32} , but, with the removal of 8^{21-59} , we have not yet been told of their failure to do so. By placing 7^{37-44} before 7^{45-52} a motive for the question is once again secured, the question in v^{45} now following immediately on the statement of v^{44} , 'no man laid hands on him.' The desire to secure this connexion may have been sufficient to cause the transposition. We may note, however, that the connexion thus obtained at 7^{44-45} is at best a makeshift, for in v^{44} it is the people who let Jesus go, while in v^{45} it is the officers who are blamed. (There are a number of such artificially secured connexions in the Gospel, apparently appropriate enough, but in reality quite arbitrary. Besides those already noted under paragraphs 7^b and 8^a we may compare $3^{30, 31}$; 'He that cometh from above . . . he that is of the earth . . . ' is an apparently obvious reference to John the Baptist whose words, as the text now stands, comprise the passage immediately preceding. But

the connexion is really quite arbitrary, for the section on the Baptist, 3²²⁻³⁰, is out of place and should be placed after 2¹², the real connexion of 3³¹ being with 3²¹.) By adopting the final order suggested in paragraph 5 above, it is the officers who are sent to arrest Jesus in 7³²; they form part of his audience during the whole discourse 7³³⁻³⁶ plus 8³¹⁻⁵⁹; they allow him to escape at 8⁵⁹, and are themselves called to account by their masters at 7⁴⁵.

In conclusion it may, I think, be fairly claimed that the final order suggested above is the best obtainable, while the application to it of Spitta's theory, though admittedly purely tentative, at least serves to corroborate the results previously arrived at from a study of the internal evidence, and, in addition, suggests a possible explanation for the insertion of the much-debated Pericope de adultera.

In the Study.

Virginibus Querisque.

God's Lamp.

'The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord.'—Pr 20²⁷.

ARE there any words in the English language you specially like or dislike? I'm sure there are. For most people have words they love and words they hate. Now, if it comes to hating, there's one word I really do hate, and I wonder if any of you hate it too. It is the word 'conscience.' To begin with, it's a horrid word to spell. You get so mixed between 's's' and 'c's.' And then there is a sound of reproof and blame and disagreeableness about it. It always seems to be pointing a long finger at you and saying in a hoarse whisper, 'Oh! oh! who did wrong?'

I know some one who hates the word just as much as I do. She has hated it ever since the first time she heard it, and that was when she was a very small girl indeed. She was a lucky little girl, for her home was in the middle of a large garden. All day long she played in that garden, and James, the gardener, allowed her to help him with his work, and even gave her a little spade and rake and hoe for her very own. One day there was great excitement, for Nancy's father had brought home a wonderful new thermometer for the garden. It was a very delicate kind of thermometer, and instead of standing up like most thermometers it had to be kept lying on its side. It was carefully fixed to a cross board nailed to the top of an upright, and Nancy and her two sisters and the gardener and the gardener's boy were all well warned that they were on no account to touch it, as moving it would put it wrong.

Well, that thermometer fascinated Nancy. She passed it fifty times a day, and every time she passed it she felt she *must* give it ever such a little wiggle just to see what would happen. This went on for about a week, and then one morning Nancy stretched out her hand and was going to give it the little wiggle when she suddenly heard the gardener's step coming round the corner, and the little wiggle changed into a very big wiggle. But what happened Nancy did not stay to see.

That evening father was very angry. 'Some one has been touching that thermometer!' he said to mother. 'Was it any of the children?' Mother walked into the nursery. 'Did any of you children touch the garden thermometer?' she asked. And two surprised little girls said 'No' quickly, and one guilty little girl stammered 'No' slowly. I suppose mother heard the guilt in the stammered 'No,' but all she said was, 'Ah, well! It must have been James. Your father is very angry about it. He will have to speak to him.' Then she shut the nursery door, and Nancy felt as if she had been shut into some horrible torture chamber. A voice inside kept repeating, 'You touched that thermometer, and you told a lie about it, and you are so mean that you are going to let James be blamed—James who is such a friend of yours—and father is so angry, perhaps James will lose his place.' For half an hour that went on, over and over again, till at last Nancy felt she must scream with the agony of it. Instead she flung open the nursery door, rushed through to the sitting-room, and, burying her face in mother's lap, sobbed, 'Oh, mother, *it was me, not James*, who touched that thermometer! And I told a lie about it!' Later in the evening Nancy overheard mother

say to father, 'I knew the child's conscience would trouble her and make her confess.' And ever since that day Nancy has hated the word 'conscience,' and thought of it as a horrible thing that tortures you till you confess.

Now I don't want you, like Nancy, to think of 'conscience' as something that tortures you till you confess. I want you to think of it as our text does. For 'the spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord' just means 'conscience is God's lamp.' Suppose we think of conscience as a *friendly lamp* instead of an instrument of torture. That is the right way to think of it. You know how it is if you are sent into a dark room to hunt for mother's scissors. Before you begin to find the scissors—if there is no electric light to snap on—you have to find the matches. Unless you have eyes like pussy, who is said to be able to see in the dark, you bump against the sharp edge of the sideboard, and come a cropper over a footstool, and almost knock over one of the ornaments on the mantelpiece before you get those matches. How thankful you are when your fingers touch the box! You strike a match and stretch up to the gas bracket and suddenly everything in the room becomes visible, and the furniture is no longer dangerous to meet.

Now life without cons—I beg your pardon—God's lamp, would be like hunting in the dark for matches—nothing more or less than a dangerous fumble. But God gives us this precious lamp to shine on life's way and to show us what to avoid. And if we trust to its guiding we shall not readily walk into danger.

But I'm sorry to tell you there are some foolish people who refuse to be guided by God's lamp. Quite a number of them indeed turn it into a dark lantern. You know what that is. It is a lantern with a movable shutter which can be closed so that no light shows. You've all seen that kind of lantern in pictures at least. It is used mostly by policemen and burglars, who don't want to show a light except when it suits them. So some people don't care to have God's light always shining on their path. It interferes with their plans, so they darken God's lamp by putting on a shutter—that is, they disobey their consciences and that darkens them for the time being. A few of them have even been known to keep the shutter on all the time. These have been people like the cruel Emperor Nero. And no one wants to imitate

people like that, who are wicked as well as foolish.

Seeing that God's lamp is so useful and such a safeguard, don't you think we'd all be wise to use it as much as we can? It's the wisest way and the easiest too, for no one is too little or too stupid to see and follow God's light. Why, even your doggie at home obeys the lamp God has given him!

Let me tell you a story to finish—and a true story too—of a dog who obeyed that lamp. In his master's house there was one room in which he was not allowed to have his food. Being a sensible, well-trained dog, he quite understood and agreed to the arrangement. One day, however, when his master returned from business he found Rover looking very unhappy and restless. He kept trotting into the forbidden room and trotting out again, and every time he trotted in he looked up at his master as much as to say, 'Please do come here,' and every time he trotted out his eyes said, 'Are you not coming yet?' At last his master followed him into the room. Rover led the way to a dark corner and pointed with his nose at something. Then he looked up as if to say, 'I know I did wrong. Please forgive me.' What do you think the something was? Why, a bone, of course! He had been eating it there and had felt that he couldn't be happy till he had confessed his fault and been forgiven.

I think that, supposing we ever do disobey God's lamp, we couldn't do better than copy Rover—confess our fault and ask for our Master's forgiveness. What do you think?

The Best Christmas Gift.

'They saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshipped him: and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts.'—Mt 2¹¹.

Let me tell you a legend that has come down to us about a great artist.

A brother and sister stood together watching a horseman dashing along a highway. The boy had a dreamy look in his eyes as he turned to his sister and said, 'Think of it, Catarina, that road leads to the wonderful city—to Venice where our St. Mark is.' His sister was older and less of a dreamer than he was. She had heard of troubles being in the city, and how people were so poor there that they sometimes hadn't even enough to eat. 'But, Tiziano,' she said, 'there are no wild flowers in

Venice. Are you tired of your own home amongst the Dolomites?’

‘No,’ he answered earnestly and somewhat sadly, ‘but the artists are there, and if I could go I might study with the great Bellini and become famous.’

Catarina’s voice sounded disappointed and impatient as she said, ‘Don’t talk so much about painting, Tiziano. The villagers are beginning to make fun of you. They say that unless you give up your dreamy ways you will come to nothing. Can you not choose a trade? Father wants you to be apprenticed to the cobbler. There are other things in the world besides painting.’

But Tiziano did not answer, he just shook his head. A whistle sounded and someone beckoned. ‘They must be beginning to weave the garlands,’ Catarina exclaimed, and they both ran off towards the village inn. It was June, when the Dolomite valleys are glorious with masses of gaily coloured flowers: and the very next day the Festival of Flowers was to take place. In a few minutes they joined the other people and began weaving garlands, gossiping and singing as they worked. Jokes were pointed at Tiziano the dreamer, Catarina unconsciously helping them on.

Ah, if only I had some paints, Tiziano thought. Maybe they would stop calling me a dreamer, for I am sure I could make a picture. Then perhaps I would be allowed to go to Venice.

How Tiziano’s desire came to be gratified is a wonderful story.

The day after the Festival he noticed stains on the stone walk—stains that had been made by flowers crushed there the day before. They were bright and fresh as if painted, and put a new idea into his head. He did not mention the matter to any one, but with the first chance he crept away from the merry-makers and went out into the meadows. Catarina saw him go, and wondered what was in his mind. She followed, and overtook him on a hillside that was all aglow with blossoms. Like most sisters, she was inquisitive over her brother’s doings. ‘Whatever are you doing, Tiziano?’ she called.

He hesitated for a moment and then said, ‘I am going to paint a picture.’

She stood and stared at him. ‘Of course you are,’ she said teasingly, ‘and without any paints.’

‘I shall use blossoms,’ he answered, ‘the colours on the stone walk.’ Then the practical Catarina

was herself set dreaming. Tiziano, she thought, might after all become a great man. She too had noticed the stains on the stone walk. She would help him. So both together they went and gathered flowers of all colours, reds, pinks, blues, yellows, purple, lavender—such shades as had been in Tiziano’s mind. Then they hurried to an old stone house that stood on land owned by their father.

Catarina wanted to watch him work, but he objected. ‘I don’t wish you to see my picture until it is finished,’ he said, ‘because at first it will not seem like a picture.’ So for many days he worked alone with his flower paints. Catarina put fresh blossoms in at the window, near which he worked, and the villagers never knew.

One evening he came to the door of the house and called to his sister outside, ‘It is finished, Catarina; and it is the best I can do.’

She went dancing in, filled with the joy of seeing her brother’s finished work. But the merriment went out of her face and she spoke reverently, ‘Oh, Tiziano, a Madonna!’

‘Yes,’ he said, ‘a Madonna and Child, with a boy like me offering a gift. It is what is in my heart, Catarina.’

She started out to tell the news. ‘Come and see,’ she called to the villagers as they passed. ‘Tiziano has painted a Madonna on the walls of the old stone house.’

The boy had heard the wonderful story of the *Babe of Bethlehem* told in such a way that he could not forget it. The flowers had breathed it, the breeze on the mountains had sung it. Quite alone in the little stone house and having no one who believed in him but his sister, the presence of the Madonna and her Child seemed to make the place holy. He fell down and worshipped, determining to grow up to be not only a great but a good man.

The village priest came to look at the fresco and was awed. He spoke little, he was too full of amazement, but his words pleased Tiziano’s father: ‘And it was painted with the juices of flowers! Il divino Tiziano!’

Tiziano was sent to Venice to study and became one of the marvels of the city. That was long, long ago. To-day, the villagers point to a statue that looks out towards the meadows in which Catarina gathered flowers for her brother, and say, ‘Il divino Tiziano! The divine Titian!’

At Christmas-time the old, old story of the birth of Jesus Christ is in all our minds. Boys and girls, imagine Tiziano showing you his picture this morning and saying, 'It is a Madonna and Child, and a boy like me offering a gift. It is what is in my heart.'

Don't you also want to offer a gift? The gift that Jesus Christ—the Babe of Bethlehem—wants from you most of all is your love.

Come sail with me,
O'er the golden sea,
To the land where the rainbow ends.
Where the rainbow ends,
And the great earth bends,
To the weight of the starry sky.
Where tempests die
With a last fierce cry,
And never a wind is wild—
There's a Mother mild,
With a little child
Like a star set on her knee.
Then bow you down,
Give Him the crown,
'Tis the Lord of the world you see.¹

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Revaluation.

'Behold, I make all things new.'—Rev 21⁶.

The tragedy of our age is calling us to rethink and restate with courage what we truly believe. Our slushy optimisms and sloppy systems of sentiment have broken down, and resolutely we have to think out what are the enduring moral and religious verities. We have to state the Christian thought, which seeks to gather the fruit of mankind's passion, and which seeks to save this poor broken world of ours. This revaluation has to cover the whole ground of religion from the doctrine of God itself; for, as Bacon said, 'It were better to have no opinion of God at all than such an opinion as is unworthy of Him.' Some changes of thought have to be made in our personal life as well as in our corporate life.

1. The first has to do with what we mean by faith. The war brought to men of imaginative mind a sense of disaster, as if the bottom had

fallen out of their world. Men felt that life was of unstable tenure, and our footing at best was insecure, but to many this brought also the sense of a great adventure. Life itself was seen to be a venture. The war in disclosing so dramatically a moral issue came as a challenge to faith. We surely came to see that faith at bottom is only venture, the venture the soul makes on life, the venture it makes on the world, the venture it makes on God. We had hardened it down to opinion and creed, but the essence of faith is simply venture. Donald Hankey, in *The Student in Arms*, said, 'True religion is betting one's life that there is a God.' We were forced to bet our life on a venture.

2. Along with this revaluation of faith comes a revaluation of some other qualities, like courage. The opposite of faith is not doubt, but fear. This is the New Testament contrast: 'Fear not, only believe.' Courage is the root virtue of human nature. You can cut a figure out of wood or stone, but you can do nothing with mud. Putty and clay are useless, unless they can be made to harden. This is the truth which in depraved form lurks in the German militarist mania. Courage is also the root of all the other virtues. Without it all the others fail at the pinch. A man may believe in truth and may love truth, but without courage in a crisis he will lie. Good intentions, without the courage to carry them out, are useless and only deceive the soul. Moral courage is closer than has often been thought to physical courage; for man is a unity. The average man's ethics which stigmatizes cowardice is right. The unpardonable sin is cowardice. The world never had more cause to admire and wonder at human courage than to-day. We cannot hold mean views of men who displayed such indomitable, inexhaustible courage. It makes no difference whether we explain some of it as mass courage. Men who could be made, however it was done, to face death so resolutely can be made to face the hardest tasks of life. There was no hope so forlorn that it could not get its volunteers. What this can mean for the huge problems of our day is incalculable. The misgivings in men's minds, the heart-sinkings about the future, the timidity which looks with shrinking on untried paths, can all be dissipated by courage. To conquer fear is the soul's triumph, and such triumph we now know is not rare.

¹ *Rough Rhymes of a Padre*, p. 38.

3. There is also a revaluation of life itself. This has been a common experience of our time. The sense of disaster caused by the shock of war, which drove so many to make a great affirmation of faith, forced them also to ask the old question, What is life? When a boy could write from the trenches that he had learned that it does not matter when a man dies, that it only matters how, all of us were compelled to make our judgments of life in *terms of quality* and not merely in terms of quantity. Many a mother asked in anguish if she had nurtured her son carefully and trained him lovingly only to have him cast in his youth as rubbish to the void. But many must have found some comfort from the thought that success in life means more than mere length of living. What more could a man ever achieve, lived he for centuries instead of years, than give his life to the highest he knows and for the highest? What more could he do in all the years of living than give himself to the greatest cause that comes his way? This is the power of the religious appeal, that it ties a life up to the greatest cause of all, and so saves it from failure. What takes the heart out of men is the thought of amounting to nothing, living for nothing, and dying for nothing. To give the full measure of devotion to a great cause is success in life. Ben Jonson long ago made the contrast in the judgment of life according to quantity or to quality.

It is not growing like a tree
In bulk, doth make man better be;
Or standing long an oak three hundred year,
To fall a log at last, dry, bald, and sere:
A lily of a day
Is fairer far in May,
Although it fall and die that night . . .
It was the plant and flower of Light.
In small proportions we just beauties see;
And in short measures life may perfect be.

We too naturally take the vulgar standard of judgment by bulk, and value men and things by the splash they make. If we can keep this finer standard, which was forced on so many through sorrow, it will make life simpler and nobler.

4. We are losing one of the great opportunities of our time, if we are failing also to put a new emphasis on sacrifice and service. Surely they have acquired a deeper meaning. In the mass, as we view the tragedy of our day, we see this torn

human life of ours with an infinite pity for its infinite pathos. Left there, it would be only empty sentiment, this vainest and most dangerous mood of the soul. To be content to speak sentimentally of the countless sacrifice in the colossal struggle would be to turn it into an idle spectacle. We must use our natural feeling to impress character and to affect life. For one thing we must surely have a new humility of soul as we think of what men have done for us. It was for us they held at such cost the frontier of civilization, for us they were wounded and bruised, for us they suffered and died; 'the chastisement of our peace was upon them, and with their stripes we are healed.' It is our flaming faith that one day they and we shall see of the travail of their soul and be satisfied; but only if we are one in spirit with them in the sacrifice. What of us, if we do not even see the burden and the glory of our generation?

We are bound up in a brotherhood of sacrifice and service. We will be unworthy of all that our heroic dead have saved for us, if we lose the conception of life as held for public ends. All our social selfishness and cruelties are due to a lack of imaginative insight, for which to-day there is no excuse.¹

Snug in my easy chair,
I stirred the fire to flame.
Fantastically fair,
The flickering fancies came
Born of heart's desire.

I shut my eyes to heat and light;
And saw in sudden night,
Crouched in the dripping dark,
With steaming shoulders stark
The man who hews the coal to feed my fire.

TWENTY-SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sleeping.

'Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping.'—Mk 13³⁶.

1. There is a sleep which is begotten of familiarity with the truth. That which once startled us may ultimately minister to a deeper slumber. The Christmas bells awoke me in the hours of night, but I lay awake until they lulled me into sleep again. The alarm bell which originally stirred us into the brightest vigilance may act at last as a

¹ Hugh Black, *The Cleavage of the World*.

lullaby to lead us into deeper sleep. The green of the spring-time arrests us by its novelty, but by summer-time the observation of most people is satiated, and the attention has gone to sleep. The permanent grandeur of the night sky has long since induced the majority of people into a profound sleep, while a display of fireworks will stir them into most deliberate attention. What is the principle underlying all this? Unwilled observation is soon satiated and goes to sleep. Willed observation, vision with executive force behind it, is full of discernment, and is continually making discoveries, which keeps the mind alert and interested. Get a will behind the eye, and the eye becomes a searchlight, and the familiar is made to disclose undreamed-of treasure. We must 'stir up the mind' by allying it to a strong, deliberate, and directive will. If the familiar thing is to abound in fruitful revelations, if I am not to sleep in mental satiety, I must control my observations with a strong hand, so that, in all its work, it is as sharp and penetrating as a needle.

Is not all this equally true as to our familiarity with Christian truth? Here in the Word of God we have pictures of the life of Christ, revelations of His mind and disclosures of His heart. We may become so familiar with them that our attention goes to sleep. There are no further unveilings, no novelties, nothing unexpected, and the familiar vision ceases to arrest our attention. What do we need? We need to 'stir up the mind,' to put some force behind it, to direct it in a strong, fresh, eager inquisitiveness. We need to put it into the attitude of 'asking,' 'seeking,' 'knocking,' and the familiar presence will reveal itself in unaccustomed guise. The familiar puts on wonderful robes when approached by a fervent inquisitor. Truth makes winsome revelations to her devoted wooers. Every day the ardent lover makes a new discovery. If men would come to the familiar pages of God's Word with mental alertness analogous to that which they bring to the inspection of a stock-and-share list, they would have gracious surprises, which would make the heart buoyant and glad. The Book promises its wealth to the wakeful. There is no book has more to say about 'unfolding,' 'revealing,' 'manifesting,' 'showing,' 'declaring,' and the only condition is that the spectator of the promised apocalypse should be an ardent seeker, stirring up his mind in eager and determined quest.

2. There is a sleep which is begotten of decided opinions. There is a very suggestive sentence in one of John Stuart Mill's essays: 'The fatal tendency of mankind to leave off thinking about a thing when it is no longer doubtful, is the cause of half their errors.' That is to say, a decided opinion may make a man thoughtless about his opinion and may induce a mental sleep. It so frequently happens, that when a man has attained a decided opinion he ties a bit of tape about it, puts it away in a pigeon-hole, and lapses into unconscious slumber. He leaves off thinking about it. When the matter was still doubtful, he was engaged in constant examination. While the conclusion was still uncertain, he remained a persistent explorer. But now that his judgment is decided, the explorer goes to sleep. What is the issue? We lose a thing when we cease to think about it. It is well to have decided thoughts, but it is bad and fatal to stop thinking. There is need in every life for a fresh stream of thought to be continually playing about the most cherished opinions, principles, and beliefs. When the photographer is developing his plate in a dark room, he keeps the liquid in constant motion, moving over the face of the plate, and evolving into clearer outline its hidden wealth. Our thought should be continually moving over the face of truths and beliefs, bringing out into discernment lines and beauties never before conceived. You have a very decided opinion on the Atonement? Then there is a peril that you may cease to think about it. The thing is settled and you may go to sleep. The man who has not a very decided opinion about the Atonement may be moving with doubtful thought round about the great mystery, and may, after all, be gathering fruit which may be unknown to you. Let us 'stir up our minds' and turn the stream of our thought on to our accepted beliefs and our decided judgments, that the wealth of these may not remain stationary, but may reveal more and more of the hidden wisdom of grace.

3. There is a sleep which is begotten of failure. Success can make a man sleep by making him cocksure. Triumph can make men careless and thoughtless. The glare of prosperity can close men's eyes in slumber. There is a 'destruction that wasteth at noon-tide.' A perilous sleep can also be begotten of failure. When repeated disappointment visits the life, when the 'wet blanket' is frequently applied to our fervent ambitions,

when the fire in the soul is damped, and enthusiasm dies out, the life is inclined to a most dangerous sleep. How many there are who were once awake and enthusiastic in civic service, or in seeking social ameliorations, or in the ministry of Christian instruction, who are now sunk in the indifference of a profound sleep. They were disappointed with the results. The grey conditions at which they worked never gained any colour. The unattractive lives to which they ministered were never transfigured. The desert never revealed even a tiny patch blossoming like the rose. And so their enthusiasm smouldered. They became lukewarm. Their reforming energy abated. They went to sleep. This is 'the pestilence that walketh in darkness.' Is not this the peril that the Apostle Paul anticipated for young and enthusiastic Timothy? He was beginning his Christian discipleship, fervent, hopeful, optimistic, with the eager consecration of his entire strength. The Apostle knew that disappointment would confront him, that cold water would be thrown upon his enthusiasm, that many a hopeful enterprise would issue in apparent failure, and the young recruit would be exposed to the indifference of a fatal sleep. 'Stir up the gift that is in thee.' Stir it into flame! Keep thy first love ardent and vigorous. Feed thy fires. Let disappointment only deepen thy consecration, and failure keep thee near the well-spring of eternal life.

4. There is a sleep which is begotten of the enchanted ground. When difficulties appear to have vanished from our life, when Apollyon no longer encounters us with dreadful front, when there is no lion in the way, when the giants are miles in the rear, and the precipitous hills, that took so long to climb, are away back on the far horizon, then we are in imminent peril of a most dangerous sleep. 'I saw then in my dream that they went on till they came to a certain country, whose air naturally tended to make one drowsy if he came a stranger into it. And here Hopeful began to be very dull and heavy of sleep, wherefore he said unto Christian, "I do now begin to grow so drowsy that I can scarcely hold up mine eyes. Let us lie down here and take a nap." "By no means," said Christian, "lest sleeping, we never awake more. Let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober."' And how did these two pilgrims contrive to keep themselves awake as they journeyed over the enchanted ground? "Now

then," said Christian, "to prevent drowsiness, let us fall into good discourse." "With all my heart," said the other. "Where shall we begin? Where God began with us?" The great dreamer has summed up their conversation in this marginal note, 'Good discourse prevents drowsiness.' They had an experience meeting. They began with the very first stages of their conversion, and told each other the story of God's redeeming grace. They reviewed the miracles of the Lord's mercy. That is the secret safety for any traveller over the enchanted ground. Begin your review 'where God began with you.' Tell over to yourself, or to others, the early story of the Lord's dealings with you. Stir up your mind with a rehearsal of the wonders and favours of God, and so far from lapsing into sleep, you shall be kept awake in a grateful song. The grace of the Lord will occupy your heart with such intensity that spiritual lapse will be impossible. 'Watch therefore . . . lest, coming suddenly, he find you sleeping.'¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Kingdom of Heaven.

'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.'—Mt 4¹⁷.

The royal note of an approaching kingdom is sounded in divers ways all through Jewish history. Prophetic messages ministered to the yearning hope from age to age. God would have His day when He would lead His people into a kingdom, glorious, triumphant, everlasting. Men watched with unsleeping vigilance for this realm of God, saluted it from afar, but never set foot within its sacred borders. At last the prophetic voice fell into silence, choked by the narrow legalism of the scribes; but the hope of the kingdom was imperishable, and soon the apocalyptic seers began to paint their glowing pictures of an imminent day when God should vindicate His holy ones by setting up the kingdom of their dreams. The Book of Daniel, the Book of Enoch, the Psalms of Solomon, and many other writings, express in varying strain these deathless aspirations, with renewed power and fascination.

Under such conditions of religious expectation Jesus began to preach. His opening proclamation was, 'Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Mt 4¹⁷). Thus the people's phrase became the Master's theme. He associated Himself with

¹ J. H. Jowett, *Brooks by the Traveller's Way*.

their hopes, but gave those hopes a broader and more spiritual meaning. Although some writers have argued otherwise (*e.g.* Weiss), there is no trace in the teaching of Jesus either of a political or of a national kingdom of God. The vision of world-rule, presented on the mountain-top, which constituted the second temptation (Lk 4⁵), plainly teaches that Jesus repudiated the narrow Jewish conceptions of the kingdom. The old phrase on His lips became the medium of a loftier idea. The genius of the Master, working with the brushes and colours of the Jewish seers, has painted a picture of the heavenly realm whose spiritual beauty far surpasses the cruder conceptions of former days.

What did Jesus mean by the kingdom of heaven? His conception had two aspects. It looked to the supremacy of God, and it looked to the blessedness of man. The former was the chief consideration, and the recognition of it was the necessary prelude to the realization of the latter.

1. Dalman in his book, *The Words of Jesus*, gives cogent reasons for the view that when our Lord spoke of the kingdom of heaven He meant the sovereignty of God. That is to say, He laid the emphasis on the supreme rule of God in human life as the essential mark of the kingdom. Once that rule is established and recognized the spiritual perfection and blessedness of mankind will follow.

It is not an exaggeration to say that this primary aspect of the kingdom has often been disregarded. Indeed, the notion of a golden age of prosperity, of perfect social conditions, in short of Utopia, is even to-day the chief element in popular ideas of the kingdom. Such notions are not wrong in themselves, but they err in placing first what should be second; what indeed cannot be fully realized except as a consequence of the recognition of God's sovereign rule. The teaching of Jesus does not countenance any view of the kingdom of heaven which either excludes God or puts God second. It is a capital error to throw out of focus the Master's vision of the kingdom by stressing the good of man and forgetting the supremacy of God. The kingdom that Jesus sees and pictures is one of human hearts rendering perfect loyalty and love to the Supreme Father of men. When He taught His disciples to utter the petition, 'Thy kingdom come,' the idea in His mind was

adequately summed up in the succeeding phrase, 'Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth.'

2. But there was another aspect to the kingdom in the mind of Jesus. The reverse side of the sovereign rule of God was the blessedness of man. Dalman says, 'The completed establishment of God as sovereign implied, for those who experienced it, absolute happiness.' This accurately expresses the teaching of our Lord. The kingdom does indeed mean the supremacy of God, but the rule of God is the sufficient cause of the joy of man. Hence it is that Jesus associates with the kingdom those festal characteristics which appear in the joy of the man who found hidden treasure, in the parable of the Great Supper, and in the rejoicings of the Marriage Feast. The members of the kingdom freely obey a rule which inspires them with happy and abiding gladness, seeing that with full spiritual sympathy they enter into the joy of their Lord.

If we bring the message of Jesus concerning the kingdom into relation with modern life, and express it in common terms, what does it mean? It means that submissive love and loyalty to God in the hearts of men should be the end of our endeavour. It means that only so can those conditions be secured which result in permanent benefit to individuals and society. It means that the hope of a good time coming, apart from the recognition of God, is an unsubstantial mirage which will recede and fade as men toil painfully towards its delusive splendours. It means that whilst purer homes, better social conditions, and all modern schemes of social improvement are legitimate and desirable aims, they are not, in themselves, capable of creating the golden age of happiness which men see in wistful visions. These ideal conditions, with the ideal atmosphere of friendliness and love essential to their maintenance, can only come as men progressively acknowledge the supreme rule of a loving Father.¹

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Coming of the Kingdom.

'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.'—Mt 4¹⁷.

Is the kingdom a present reality or a future hope? At first the words of Jesus on this point seem to lack consistency, and thus some writers

¹ A. H. Lowe, *The Manner of the Master and Studies in His Teaching*.

maintain that Jesus always thought of the kingdom as present, whilst others as strongly affirm that He always viewed it as a future blessing.

There is, however, no reason to take an uncompromising stand for either of these positions. What Jesus has to say as to the time of the kingdom's manifestation is capable of being harmonized on broad and general lines, even though we may leave, here and there, some matters that cannot be fully explained.

The various sayings of Jesus which deal with this aspect of the subject need not now be set out in detail. It will be sufficient to notice that they fall into three classes, and to give an instance of each type. The first type consists of sayings which suggest the nearness of the kingdom, as when Jesus said, 'Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' The second implies that the kingdom is already present, as in the saying, 'The kingdom of God is among you.' The third contains sayings which seem to involve the gradual growth of the kingdom to a distant day of crisis. The parable of the Mustard Seed is an instance; and the figure of the wheat which slowly ripens and then is suddenly harvested is another example.

1. What did Jesus mean when He said that the kingdom of heaven was at hand? Schweitzer and his school might say that He referred to the great apocalyptic transformation and judgment which Jesus, in common with John the Baptist and others, was expecting in the immediate future. But the words do not necessarily carry this meaning. Do they not refer to the beginning of the kingdom rather than to its consummation? This seems more probable. The kingdom, foreshadowed for so long, is now definitely inaugurated. It is, so to speak, available in a new and special way. Jesus laid down the conditions of entrance, and defined its scope. The conditions were repentance and faith, and the kingdom was thrown open to all mankind. Never before had the kingdom of God been proclaimed on such broad and liberal terms. For the first time that kingdom was 'at hand,' that is to say, available in the living present to every class and race. Men needed not any longer to gaze across the ages for it; they had no more any need to yearn hopelessly for a kingdom which was the heritage of a select few. All might now come under this supreme rule of God, and in it find their highest good.

2. The next step in our study is to mark the

kingdom as actually present. It was not very long after Jesus had proclaimed the imminence of the kingdom that He was able to say that it was being subject to violent capture, and that enthusiastic people were carrying it by storm. The facts of the gospel illustrate this word. Fishermen from the lake of Galilee, tax gatherers from Capernaum and Jericho, teachers from Jerusalem, rich men from the country, sinners from the city streets, and strangers from Samaria and Sidon, were offering their allegiance to Jesus, in whom the sovereign rule of God was perfectly recognized and as perfectly obeyed. In other words, as men accepted Jesus they accepted the kingdom, and in His Person and work it was present. He Himself once said that His work of casting out demons was a proof that the kingdom of God had arrived (Lk 11²⁰). And in another place we read that He pronounced His disciples blessed because they saw what prophets and righteous men had in vain desired to see; which was nothing less than the kingdom. Moreover, when He said, 'The kingdom of God is among you,' He was only stating directly what is implied in many of His other sayings and parables. The theory that His work was simply a preparation for a future kingdom does not therefore seem capable of satisfactory proof.

3. But the third class of sayings mentioned above does find a place for the consummation of the kingdom in the future. The kingdom already inaugurated is destined to grow in the souls and societies of mankind. The parables of the Tares and Wheat, the Mustard Seed, and the Leaven seem clearly to teach this, and in the face of them it is difficult to maintain that Jesus looked for an immediate appearance of the perfected kingdom. He saw rather a process of development, an historical unfolding of the glories of the kingdom as men more and more submitted themselves to the rule of God. This process would have its stages, which in one parable He refers to as the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear. And there are some of us who are inclined to believe, in view of the unimaginable periods of physical evolution, that the moral kingdom of Jesus is yet but 'a blade,' whose perfect beauty has still to come.

Such a view of the future development of the kingdom is not inconsistent with the belief that the kingdom will have its times of special crisis, its 'days of the Son of Man,' when there shall

suddenly break upon the vision of men a fresh revelation of its glory and power, such that the rule of God will seem to be on the verge of perfect victory. Was not Pentecost such a Day, when men felt the quickening winds of God's power and its cleansing flame? Was not the Reformation such a Day, when hoary superstitions perished and an epoch of living faith began? Was not the

eighteenth-century revival another such Day, when vicious and hardened sinners came, with broken cries of penitence, to the feet of Jesus? Are not such momentous experiences worthy to be described in the glowing colours of Jesus, as a coming of the Son of Man in power and great glory?¹

¹ A. H. Lowe, *The Manner of the Master and Studies in His Teaching*.

Thirty Years of Palestine Exploration.

By R. A. S. MACALISTER, LITT.D., F.S.A., PROFESSOR OF CELTIC ARCHÆOLOGY, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN; FORMERLY DIRECTOR OF EXCAVATIONS IN PALESTINE.

JUST thirty years ago there was published a brochure of modest appearance, bound in card-board, containing 62 pages and 10 plates, and bearing the simple title *Tell el Hesi (Lachish)*, by W. M. Flinders Petrie. This little work, of which it is now extremely difficult to obtain a copy, was nothing less than the foundation-stone of a new science. It was the report of the first excavation made in one of the many mounds that cover the ancient country towns of Palestine.

Petrie's excavation of Tell el-Hesi was of course not the very first excavation that had ever been made in the country. Some tentative work of this kind had been done by others in previous years, at Jerusalem and elsewhere. But it was the first conducted on modern scientific lines. In previous excavations the directors were not aware of the immense importance of the 'unconsidered trifles' that an ancient site contains. Large buildings and, especially, written documents were their objective; and their work was, if not actually, at any rate unconsciously, subservient to the definite aim of finding answers to the many questions regarding the nature and authenticity of the Biblical texts, which were being asked with more and more insistence from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards. It is not too much to say that the excavator who works with any *arrière-pensée*, however honourable it may be, courts disaster. His sole aim must be to find what is in his site, and then to see what legitimate deductions can be drawn from what he uncovers.

Petrie was the first to attach especial importance to the most seemingly insignificant finds—the

chips of broken pottery, lying in profusion on the surface of the earth, or scattered through the buried strata. To his expert eye these fragments told a tale to which his predecessors had been blind and deaf. As a result of his six weeks' exploration, the science of Palestinian ceramics was established on a sound basis, and a powerful new instrument was put into the hands of excavators to enable them to date their sites. It was proved that every age had its own special style of pottery, distinguished by ware, shape, ornamentation, and manner of baking; and that, therefore, when a site or a stratum contained pottery of a certain kind, its date was fixed as absolutely as though a stone inscribed with the name of a historical monarch had been found there. Indeed, the evidence of the pottery is even more certain than that of an inscription. Thrown-away potsherds lie where they fall, and date the accumulation; but an inscribed stone may be moved from place to place, and may be discovered at last in very different surroundings, both topographically and chronologically, from those in which it was first set up.

Tell el-Hesi was an ideal site for beginning this work. It had been occupied for a long time, and had had its share of misfortunes, all marked in one way or another by traces left in its debris. Beds of ashes were a permanent record of conflagrations, and gave a chronological fulcrum—for everything under the bed must necessarily be older than the catastrophe, everything above it must be later. A river had scarped the side of the mound, so that the edges of all the strata were exposed; it was

therefore possible for the explorer to pass from one level to another, to collect pottery from one layer and compare it with sherds from another, with the least possible difficulty. In consequence, the principles established by Professor Petrie have remained unshaken by all the subsequent excavations that have taken place; requiring modification in detail only, especially in nomenclature—for example, what he calls ‘Phœnician’ ware we now know to call ‘Cypriote.’

Professor Petrie having thus worked for six weeks, returned to his duties in Egypt, to which, from his point of view, his Palestinian researches had been ancillary. The work which he began at Tell el-Hesi was finished by his successor, Dr. Frederick Jones Bliss, son of the venerable and honoured Dr. Daniel Bliss, the first president of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut. Dr. Frederick Bliss had been born and had lived most of his life in Syria: he thus had a familiarity with the country, its ways, and its language such as a stranger could hardly hope to acquire; no small qualification for work which necessarily depends on Oriental labour for its prosecution. At Tell el-Hesi he cut down one-third of the whole mound, and the results of his work were published by the Palestine Exploration Fund, the organisers and paymasters of the campaign, in a small volume entitled *A Mound of Many Cities*. It was still the day of small things; yet there was the promise of greater things in store. Petrie’s results were fully confirmed; Egyptian scarabs scattered through the strata helped to secure yet more closely the pottery sheet-anchor of Chronology. Most important of all was the discovery of the first cuneiform tablet to be found in Palestinian soil—a discovery that had been looked for with confidence from the time when the great find at Tell el-Amarna had revealed to us the Palestinian governors using this script in their correspondence with the Egyptian king. The Tell el-Hesi tablet, by bearing the name of Zimrida (which also appears in the Amarna correspondence), was closely linked with that series of documents.

When the work at Tell el-Hesi was closed, the Palestine Exploration Fund turned its attention once more to its old love—Jerusalem. But perhaps it may be permitted to say that this was a mistake. There is an important principle which it is unfortunately now too late to insist upon, as so few virgin countries remain for archæological excava-

tion, namely, that hands should be kept off all the first-magnitude sites until those of lesser importance have been thoroughly examined. *Fiat experimentum in corpore vili* is ever the soundest of principles. Let us do the preliminary chronological investigation in some site of no historical importance, and then, having learned all that it has to tell us, gradually work through the second-class sites, ending with those of outstanding importance. The reason of this principle should be obvious. Excavation is necessarily and inevitably destructive. Walls *must* be pulled down to get at what lies below them. Tomb-deposits *must* be disturbed. Notes and photographs must be taken on the spot and at the moment; else they are valueless, and the lessons for science which the site contains are for ever lost. The excavation becomes what is colloquially but expressively called a ‘hogging’ for curiosities; and to ‘hog’ is the unpardonable crime in Archæology. But even the most conscientious note-taker must know what notes to take and what to look for and observe; it is only experience that will teach him the significance of small points which at first he might not so much as observe. To gain that experience, a small site, the destruction of which would not be a scientific calamity, ought to be studied first. Every stone in Jerusalem is sacred, and the site should be treated as tenderly as a manuscript containing literary matter of value, the parchment of which has become rotten.

However, work began under Dr. Bliss at Jerusalem in 1894 and continued till 1897. With Dr. Bliss was associated in this work Mr. A. C. Dickie, an architect, now the Professor of Architecture in Manchester University. Starting from the famous scarp on Mount Zion, associated with the name of Henry Maudslay, who had first called attention to it, trenches and tunnels were cut along the line of the foundation of the old south wall of the city, surrounding the hill called Ophel. By this work the southern limit of the city at different periods of history was determined. Numerous interesting discoveries were incidentally made, notably the church erected over the Pool of Siloam by the Empress Eudocia.

This work was carried on in the face of many difficulties. Land is valuable close to a large city, and kitchen-garden produce acquires extraordinary worth when its owners learn that it grows over an ancient site which an explorer desires to examine.

Moreover, there is always danger, when digging at Jerusalem, that some fanatic will raise the cry that the Haram is in danger of profanation. At Jerusalem, beyond all places, the explorer has to submit to the perpetual nuisance of inquisitive tourists wishing to see what there is to see, and taking up valuable time which can ill be spared by a small staff. However, the work was successfully carried through in the face of these and similar obstacles; the increased size of the monograph on Jerusalem is an index of the increased skill and knowledge that was brought to bear on this work.

When the permit for the excavation at Jerusalem expired, and the monograph was finished, the Palestine Exploration Fund returned to the country towns in the Shephelah. At the mouth of one of the great valleys, that act as passes through the foothills of Judæa, there stands the imposing mound called Tell es-Safi, long identified, on good grounds, with Gath. This was selected as the central site of the next campaign; but with it were included a number of other sites in the neighbourhood, which the committee of the Fund considered might also be examined. Application was made to the Turkish authorities for permits to examine nine sites in all; these were granted, with one exception, the story of which is not uncharacteristic of the difficulties which met the explorer working in Turkish territory. The site in question, Askalan, was not of the slightest importance. It was withheld because the Turkish authorities confused it with Askalun, that is, Ashkelon, on the alleged ground that there were certain holy places there which the exploration would interfere with. The real reason, no doubt, was that as Askalun is near the sea, it would have been possible for an explorer to evade the law requiring all the antiquities found in an excavation to be given up to the Turkish government.

However, Askalan was not desired, and Askalan was too insignificant to regret. Indeed, of the eight sites remaining, only four were touched during the term of the permit: Tell es-Safi itself, with Tell Zakariya (probably Azekah), Tell el-Judeideh (unidentified), and Tell Sandahannah (Moreseth). Of these, the first-named was, in the abstract, unquestionably the most important; but it proved very disappointing. The summit of the mound was crowned by a village of unusually large size, inhabited by a peculiarly greedy and cantankerous breed of Fellahin; and round the village extended

on every side the cemeteries where generations of its folk had been buried, most effectively sealing up the precious underlying accumulations from the truth-seeking archæologist. Only a few places were found in the whole tell where pits could be sunk, and these proved singularly unproductive. The city wall was traced, but had it not been for a comparatively late rubbish-heap that was found outside one corner of the wall, containing broken fragments of statuettes and other odds and ends, hardly anything worth mention would have been found on this site at all. The other three sites were much more remunerative. Some interesting buildings were found; indeed, at Tell Sandahannah the whole site of the Hellenistic city was exposed and planned. Much was added to our previous knowledge of the pottery. Some important tombs were discovered and searched—although, alas, the best of all, the great tomb of Apollophanes at Moreseth, was missed by the excavators, and found afterwards by Fellahin, who dispersed its contents unrecorded. Fortunately Science, embodied in Dr. J. P. Peters of New York and Professor Hermann Thiersch of Freiburg, were in time to save the wall-paintings from being cut off the wall for sale, and to place them on permanent record in their work *The Marissa Tombs*, published by the Palestine Exploration Fund. During this campaign a beginning was made with an exploration of the extraordinary caves which are among the most remarkable monuments of antiquity in southern Palestine: huge labyrinths of chamber after chamber—in at least one case there are as many as sixty chambers in a single group—excavated out of the soft chalky rock at some quite unknown time, to serve some quite unknown purpose.

When this campaign was completed, Dr. Bliss retired from the service of the Fund, and work was begun under a new director. The site chosen for the next excavation was Gezer; a happy choice, for the identification was certain, and sufficient details of the history of this city were already known to offer hopes that further correlations between culture and history might be revealed. The city had been identified with the mound called Tell el-Jazari, beside the village of Abu Shusheh near Ramleh, by Professor Clermont-Ganneau, in the year 1871; and the identification had been confirmed by an inscription found close by—a circumstance which remained unique until

an inscription in the tomb of Apollophanes established the identity of Tell Sandahannah with Marissa (Moreseth). It was on an important highway, and was a centre of trade with Egypt: it had been in Egyptian hands, and also in Philistine hands: it had contributed to the Tell el-Amarna correspondence. Here Amorite, Philistine, Egyptian, Hebrew, had all met, and might all have been expected to leave recognizable traces.

Remains of all periods from very early Canaanite or Pre-Canaanite to Herodian times were found, although in many respects the results of the excavations differed from the anticipations. The mound is of huge size, and, though the work lasted through five years, it was not possible to dig more than about three-fifths of the whole.

The accumulation of ancient deposit ranged in depth from 6 to 40 feet. In the underlying rock there were many caves, partly artificial, partly natural, which had been used as dwellings and as sepulchres by the earliest inhabitants. One of these was decorated with a frieze of figures of animals, rudely engraved in outline. Another had been used as a kind of crematorium, and was strewn with ashes. Most remarkable among the rock-cuttings was the great water tunnel, a huge passage sloping downwards through the rock to a depth of about 90 feet, giving access to a great cave in which rose a powerful spring of water. This excavation was kindred to the elaborate series of passages and galleries which radiate from the Virgin's fountain at Jerusalem, originally explored by Sir Charles Warren, and reopened in a curious treasure-hunting expedition that took place in 1909.

Several large residential buildings, castles or palaces, were found here and there; the two city walls were exposed—great structures some 15 feet in thickness—and their architectural history determined. In the centre of the town was found an open space, across which ran an imposing line of rude stone pillars, which it is most reasonable to regard as *masseboth*. Although four of the Tell el-Amarna letters came from Gezer, no further documents of this series were discovered. Two later contract-tablets, however, came to light, written in Assyrian, and referring to the sale of land and other property, doubtless in or near the city itself. These belonged to the time of the Assyrian captivity. A limestone tablet inscribed with Hebrew also came to light. Its contents

were not very exciting—nothing but a list of the agricultural operations of successive months. The tablet has, however, the interest of being the oldest extant document in the Hebrew language. Many tombs were opened, and a first attempt was made at a history of burial customs in the country. Unfortunately no tomb was discovered comparable with the great monument of Apollophanes.

Hitherto Britain, and the Palestine Exploration Fund, had enjoyed a monopoly of legitimate excavation in the country—legitimate, because unfortunately many of the ancient sites and cemeteries had suffered from the attentions of dealers' agents and other plunderers. But as it began to be realized that the exploration of the Palestinian tells, while it could not promise such rich rewards as were to be obtained in Egypt or in Mesopotamia, yet might yield fruit by no means contemptible, other nations began to take part in the work. The first to join in this friendly rivalry was Austria, which, in the person of Professor Sellin, then of Vienna, undertook the exploration of Taanach—the first site to be examined on the plain of Esdraelon. The general civilization proved to be identical with that revealed in the southern Palestinian sites. Indeed, Palestine is so small a country, that it is unlikely that it should be found to be divided into different zones of culture. Among the more special finds are to be named the now famous altar of terra-cotta, adorned with strange figures of lions, and a number of cuneiform tablets, the correspondence of one Ishtar-washur, which belong to the Tell el-Amarna period.

Germany followed shortly afterwards, and, represented by Dr. G. Schumacher, attacked the twin mound of Taanach, that is to say, Megiddo (Tell el-Mutasellim). Here again the usual Palestinian culture was revealed, the same monotony of pottery, rude house walls, small figurines of a goddess (probably the 'Queen of Heaven,' against whom Jeremiah inveighed with little success). The chief 'find' at Megiddo, which, on the whole, produced little of outstanding interest, was a seal, bearing a finely engraved figure of a lion, and a Hebrew inscription stating that it belonged to one Shama', described as 'servant of Jeroboam'—very probably King Jeroboam II.

America followed next, with an elaborate and extensive exploration of the site of Samaria. It is, however, impossible to say much about this.

investigation here, as the results of the excavation as yet await publication, and it is not permissible to intrude on the rights of the explorers. When the publication does make its appearance it will be cordially welcomed, as the curiosity that was aroused by the announcement of the discovery of ostraka with Hebrew graffiti still remains only partially satisfied. Important Herodian buildings were also uncovered, the description of which will be useful additions to the literature of the architectural history of the country.

The next site examined, again under German auspices, was that of Jericho. Its results were not very stimulating; the city walls were exposed and carefully studied, and a considerable area exposed, but nothing of special importance seems to have been found. Much the same may be said of the partial excavation of 'Ain esh-Shems (Bethshemesh) under the Palestine Exploration Fund. This completes the record of excavations that have been made in the country down to the beginning of the war.

During the years of the war, naturally, no scientific research could be carried out. Some accidental discoveries were made in the course of military operations, such as a fine mosaic pavement uncovered in the neighbourhood of Gaza; and, in some cases, these were worthily conserved. But the end of the war has brought a new *régime*, and new duties, devolving especially upon Britain as Mandatory for Palestine.

The department of antiquities seems to have been well organized already. Under the Turkish rule everything was prohibited; but everything was possible. A caustic Armenian gentleman, formerly well known to the present writer, used to say that the Turk had one virtue and only one—he would take a bribe. Illicit excavation was prohibited with a drastic thoroughness that was worthy of a civilized nation; but diggers and dealers had but to give a small *douceur* to the local administrator of law and order to ensure his complaisance. The only result of the Turkish law, therefore, was to put serious difficulties in the way of legitimate investigators, while allowing plunderers practically a free hand. This is no longer the case.

Moreover, an important move forward has been made by the establishment of a British School of Archæology in Jerusalem. This body, which will work in collaboration with the American School

of Archæology that has existed there from the beginning of the century, and with the yet older foundation, the magnificent *École biblique* conducted by learned members of the Dominican Order, is designed for training students in archæological method, and giving them a practical experience of research work in its several branches. It is too early yet to speak of the excavation of Ashkelon, which has been conducted during the past year by the Palestine Exploration Fund in collaboration with this new foundation; as yet only general details have been published of the discoveries, and, as in the case of Samaria, we must await the official report.

For all these works and institutions money is necessary, and unless Britain greatly increases the support which she has hitherto given to them she will lose the position in the front rank of Palestine research which she has hitherto held. Other nations are pressing hard upon her in the competition; thus, America is beginning the excavation of the great mound that covers the important city of Beth-Shean. It is not to the credit of any country that it is prepared to squander tens of thousands on cinemas, horse and other races, football matches, and similar follies, but starves the work of research in the land which is the centre of the Faith that it at least nominally professes.

Looking back over the general results of the last thirty years' work of exploration in Palestine, the strongest impression which it leaves on the mind is a deepened sense of the wonder of the Old Testament. Even if we throw overboard all theories of a supernatural inspiration, and agree to regard that marvellous anthology of poetry, history, philosophy, and law as the unaided product of the human intellect, its growth in the uncongenial soil and surroundings of Palestine would still be one of the greatest miracles of human history. All the excavations which we have enumerated have uniformly shown that the standard of material civilization was low throughout the whole time covered by the Old Testament history. Houses are all poor and badly built. The same forms of pottery and of implements emerge from the soil, over and over again, with tedious uniformity. The only objects that can be called works of art are importations from Egypt, Crete, Cyprus, or Mesopotamia. Yet it was in these uninspiring conditions that the greatest poetry in the world was written, and that text-books of history were first

compiled. The annals of Egyptian and Assyrian kings are not text-books of history; they are political manifestoes setting forth the glory of the monarch in whose name they were issued. Of history proper, it is the custom to call Herodotus the 'Father'; yet, a couple of centuries or so before Herodotus, those great unknowns, whom we coldly denote by the algebraical symbols 'J' and 'E,' were writing the history of their people, with an unsurpassed literary skill, amid the squalid surroundings of Palestine. What makes this fact even more remarkable is, that the historic sense was not highly developed among the people at large. It is possible that Israelite kings set up monuments of their warfare; if Mesha, king of Moab, did so, Solomon, or Omri, or Jeroboam, or Uzziah might have been expected to do so, and may have done so, for all that we know; but nothing of the sort has yet been found. There

was so little historic instinct among the people, as a whole, that they even neglected to record the names of the dead buried in the tombs which they hewed from the rock with such great labour. Round Jerusalem there are scores, even hundreds, of rock-cut tombs, some of them of great extent; but hardly any of them bear inscriptions, and, when they do, these in almost every case commemorate foreigners—Greeks, Romans, and in one case a German.

The drab monotony of the civilization revealed by the diggings, darkened still further, as it is, by statuettes and other objects that frequently come to light to testify to the crudity of the nature-worship followed by the rank and file of the people, is a background which sets forth in greater brilliance the prophets and psalmists, the teachers and the tellers of tales, who played out their parts upon a stage so strangely incongruous.

Contributions and Comments.

'Convict of Justice.'

MAY a Roman Catholic have a shot at interpreting the above phrase? The ungodly in the presence of the Just or Righteous are *convicted*, when conscience is awakened, not only concerning their own sins, but also concerning (περί) the justice of the just which they have shirked or impeded or extinguished. If they have driven away the Just One altogether, the thought of Him and His justice 'convicts' them all the more acutely of sinfulness. When the Paraclete has been sent, the justice of the just is as much a source of *conviction* and as much a cause of self-condemnation to them as their own misdeeds. The angelic qualities of the good and our own unworthiness are most keenly realized when they have left the earth.

W. H. MITCHELL.

Hampstead.

Targumism in the New Testament.

In his interesting article on 'Traces of Targumism in the New Testament' in the May EXPOSITORY TIMES, Professor J. Rendel Harris might have added to his argument by noticing the peculiarly Targumic

character of the expressions, 'the *throne* of the Majesty,' He 8¹; 'the *throne* of God, Rev 14⁵ (in restored text). As comparison with He 1⁸ shows, 'The Throne of the Majesty' equals the Majesty, which is a surrogate for Deity, *i.e.* the Throne is equally a surrogate therefor. The commentators on Hebrews appear to have ignored this bit of Rabbinism, whose history extends back to Ezk 1²⁶. Here the prophet sees borne above the Four Animals a Firmament, and upon the Firmament that which looked like a Throne, and upon the Throne that which had the appearance of a Man. The reference to this 'Throne of the Glory' is frequent in Rabbinic literature, *e.g.* Targum, Jer. to Gn 28¹²; Ex 24¹⁰, 31¹⁸. This Throne or moving Chariot became the symbol of the mysteries of the Divine Being, well known in Rabbinic lore as the Ma'ase Merkabah, the Mysteries (Magic) of the Chariot. The Throne of the Glory was itself, like the Law, pre-existent to Creation, Pesachim 54a, Bereshith Rabba, 1, etc. As the place *where* of God it became the surrogate of Deity, in the same way as Heaven obtained that equivalence, or Place (*maqom*). For the latter expression I might refer to an article of mine in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1905, p. 17. Comparisons are numerous

in religions, e.g. the *beth-el*, 'house of god,' became a god, and as we know now from the Elephantine papyri, the *masjad*, 'place of worship,' *mosque*, likewise.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

University of Pennsylvania.

Gideon's Three Hundred.

PROFESSOR BURNEY'S interpretation of Jg 7⁷, quoted on p. 285 of the March issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, is based on the supposition that the 300 men who 'lapped' stretched themselves at ease by the side of the pool and drank direct of the water. This is the view of Josephus. But surely this 'mouth-to-water' method was precisely the one which the 300 did *not* adopt. Allowing, as Sir George Adam Smith notes in his volume of sermons *The Forgiveness of Sins*, that 'the story requires a good deal of textual criticism,' a commonsense reading of the passage shows that it was the 9700 majority who lay prone, while it was the 300 minority who, at greater inconvenience and with less immediate satisfaction, drank by 'putting their hand to their mouth.' So, at least, Principal Smith in his sermon on 'Gideon,' Dr. Marcus Dods in *Israel's Iron Age*, etc.

The interpretation of the attitude adopted remains a difficulty. Most make the distinction between the majority and the minority one of military experience, and the 300, they suggest, showed the wariness of veterans by remaining on their feet, alert and ready on the instant to note and meet any movement on the part of the enemy. Some have seen in the respective attitudes a religious symbolism, for the Jew stood at prayer, while the worshipper of Baal knelt. Is not the distinction one of character? The most of the 10,000 thought of nothing but the satisfaction of their natural desires, and they thrust their very faces into the stream that they might the more speedily stay their cravings. The 300, on the other hand, showed firmness and reliance and self-control by adopting a method which took longer, was more laborious, was probably less satisfying, but which had the supreme advantage of leaving them complete masters of themselves. The distinction, then, is between those who lived for the satisfaction of the moment's desire and those who thought more and looked further; between those who lived for the present and to whom a draught

of water at that moment was the crazed be-all of existence, and those who never lost sight of the future in the present nor confused the accidental with the essential, and to whom that desirable draught of water was but a refreshing preparation for stern work to come.

HARRY SMITH.

Old Kilpatrick.

Judges v. 22.

AN ancient and poetical piece like the Song of Deborah naturally has its difficulties for translators and commentators. Fresh light is always desirable. A.V. 'Then were the horsehoofs broken' makes us ask whether horses have been known to break their hoofs by excessive activity. Can the Hebrew word mean horseshoes? Then we get an archæological problem. Are we to call the figure a piece of Oriental exaggeration?

The hoof of an animal is always פֶּרֶסָה, except here. The word occurs fifteen times, and in Is 5²⁸, Ezk 26¹¹ must mean the hoofs of *horses*. Here we have עֶקֶב דִּים = heel (not heels) of a horse. Why should the regular word be changed?

עֶקֶב means not only 'heel,' but the spoor, trace, mark made by it, or by any footstep. So Ps 77¹⁹, 'Thy *footsteps* were not known.' Ps 56⁵, 'They (spies, watchers) mark my steps.' Why should we not conceive of the poet as seeing the excited cavalry and chariot horses floundering in the soft mire after the storm (4^{19, 20}) and the rising of the river Kishon (4⁷ 5²¹) in their efforts to escape? It is just soft miry ground which would not break (A.V.) the hoofs or the horseshoes. LXX (B), ἐνεποδίσθησαν means 'to hinder,' 'place an obstacle,' 'check,' 'put the feet in bonds' (Liddell and Scott) —R.V. 'stamp' suits this view.

LXX (A) ἀπεκόπησαν πτέρναι ἵππου reminds us that πτερνο-κοπέω is 'to stamp with the heels.' The Hebrew הִלְכֵם is 'to smite,' 'hammer,' 'stamp.' The cavalry and chariot horses (ἵππου) churned up the mud, became fixed in it, so that Sisera 'fled away on his feet' (4¹⁷).

The catastrophe of Ex 14²⁵ was repeated, as to the horses and chariots becoming immovable, and the rushing Kishon 'swept them away' as the returning sea did at the Exodus (Jg 5²¹).

GEORGE FARMER.

Walmer.

Entre Nous.

A PSALM.

'It is quite true that Cromwell's action not unfrequently jars with Christianity as we in this nineteenth century understand it. But, as I have said, his religion and that of the Puritans was based largely on constant, literal, daily reading of the Old Testament. The newer criticism would have found no patron in Cromwell. Indeed, I believe that its professors would have fared but ill at his hands. He himself lived with an absolutely childlike faith in the atmosphere and with the persons of the Old Testament. Joshua and Samuel and Elijah were as real and living beings to him as any people in history, or any of the persons by whom he was surrounded. His favourite psalm, we are told, was the 68th—the psalm that, even in the tumult of the victory of Dunbar, he shouted on the field of battle before he ordered the pursuit of the retreating army. But it always seemed to me that another psalm, the 149th, much more closely reproduces the character, the ideas, and the practice of Cromwell: "Let the saints be joyful in glory . . . Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; To execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people; To bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; To execute upon them the judgement written: This honour have all his saints." It is not a comfortable or patient or long-suffering creed, it is true; but, remember, it is the creed that first convulsed and then governed England—the faith of men who carried their iron gospel into their iron lives.'¹

A TEXT.

Ezekiel xviii. 2.

'Habitual drunkenness on the part of a parent or of the parents may produce modifications, and may be followed by dire results in the offspring. Is this not evidence enough of the transmission of modifications? Certainly not to those who wish to think clearly. (1) There is some evidence that thorough poisoning of the body may cause deterioration of the germ-cells of either parent; (2) the intemperate habits of the parent may be the expression of an inherited lack of control, and

it is this lack that is transmitted to the offspring, where it may find the same or some other expression; (3) drunkenness on the mother's part may mean serious enfeebling of the general vigour of the child during the period of ante-natal partnership; (4) some children get alcohol as part of their food from the days of suckling onwards. The question is not easy. A belief in the transmission of modifications was perhaps expressed in the old Hebraic proverb: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge'—a proverb which the prophet Ezekiel with great solemnity said was not to be used any more in Israel (Ezk 18²). Now, if 'setting on edge' was a structural modification, and if the children's teeth were 'set on edge' because of what had happened to their fathers in direct consequence of eating sour grapes, there would have been a presumption in favour of a belief in the transmission of this acquired character. It would still be necessary, however, to be very careful in our conclusion—to inquire, for instance, whether the children had not been in the vineyard too. If, as Romanes said, the children were born with wry necks, we should perhaps have to deal with an indirect result of the parental indiscretion, and not with any direct representation in the inheritance of that particular modification which was produced in the parents as the direct result of eating sour grapes.'²

SOME TOPICS.

Heaven lies about us in our Infancy.

'One girl I have christened "Topsy," and I only wish you could see her when she is in one of her tantrums, which she has at frequent intervals. With her flashing black eyes, straight, jet-black hair, square, squat shoulders, she looks the very embodiment of the Evil One. She is twelve, but shows neither ability nor desire to learn. Her habits are disgusting, and unless closely watched she will be found filling her pockets with the contents of the garbage pail—and this in spite of the fact that we are no longer dining off one herring. She says that her ambition in life is to become like a fat pig! Last night, when the children were safely tucked in bed and I had sat

¹ Lord Rosebery, *Miscellanies*, i. 97.

² J. Arthur Thomson, *The Control of Life*, p. 101 f.

down to write to you, piercing shrieks were heard resounding through the stillness of the house. A tour of investigation revealed Topsy creeping from bed to bed in the darkness, pretending to cut the throats of the girls with a large carving-knife which she had stolen for this purpose. To-day Topsy is going around with her hands tied behind her back as a punishment, and in the hope that without the use of her hands we may have one day of peace at least. Poor Topsy, kindness and severity alike seem unavailing. She steals and lies with the greatest readiness, and one wonders what life holds in store for her.'

The book is called *Le petit Nord: Annals of a Labrador Harbour* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is a record of a year's stay at the place so called as head of a children's hospital. But who was head we are not told. We know only that two authors' names are on the book, Anne Grenfell and Katie Spalding, and that Anne Grenfell is the wife of the famous Dr. Grenfell of Labrador. The story is told in letters home. Lively and amusing the letters are, but tragedy is never far away from comedy, especially in Labrador.

A Valuable Breed.

The author who signs himself 20/1631 is probably easily identified. He makes no other attempt to conceal himself. The Prime Minister is one of his (not very intimate) friends. He discourses familiarly about Mr. Balfour and many other parliamentary and famous men. The whimsical signature seems used to give him leave to say all that comes into his head on *Some Personalities* (Murray; 15s. net), and he says it. This is his experience as a Civil Servant:

'If anyone would know with how little wisdom the world is governed he need only enter the Civil Service of the British Empire. I entered it by the open door of competition with some thousand more suitable candidates, and was appointed to the General Register Office in Dublin. The Registrar-General of Ireland had applied for the services of a French scholar to correspond with foreign bureaux, and when the news of my appointment reached me I happened to be on a tour in France. I applied for permission to complete my journey, and you would have thought the Registrar-General would have been only too glad for me to improve my knowledge of the language. That only shows your ignorance

of the Service. I was commanded to repair to my post within a fortnight. I found the foreign correspondence in the hands of a senior clerk who had no idea of relinquishing his functions; and after spending some months in a cellar among the records of mortality, I was entrusted with the compilation of statistics.

'I was in charge of the emigration statistics in the year when 100,000 souls left Ireland out of a population of less than 5,000,000. Apart from adding up that miserable sum, most of the work I had to do appeared to me a waste of time and stationery. I began badly with the invention of a new method of checking the figures which effected a saving of time with an increase of accuracy. This brought me a reproof from my superior official, and an order to return to the old-fashioned way. I got my own back, I think, over a humorous item in the agricultural statistics. These were sheets filled up by the constabulary once a year, and purported to be a faithful account of the crops raised and the live stock kept on every holding in the country. One year the Registrar-General, in a burst of enterprise, decided to add three new columns to the returns, dealing with the butter, the poultry and even the eggs. This inquiry was sprung on the long-suffering peasantry without any warning; and if you know anything of Ireland you may easily imagine the sort of information the constabulary were likely to extract from a small Connemara holder with an uncertain memory and a strong desire to see the peeler off his premises. Many of the constables seemed to have filled up the columns as Mr. Weller spelt, according to their own taste and fancy, without going through any useless formalities. I was malicious enough to compare the total of poultry with the total of eggs in one district, and to draw my chief's attention to the surprising fact thereby disclosed, that every cock, hen and chicken in that part of Ireland had laid six eggs a day for an entire twelvemonth. The breed must have been a valuable one; it was before the days of intensive culture, too. My detestable zeal broke the Registrar-General's heart, and that return never reached the foreign bureaux.'

The Tower of Babel.

'Ukepenopfü was the first being. Her descendants are very many. Instead of dying she was translated into heaven. Later on her descendants

thought to communicate with her by building a tower up to heaven, up which they would go and talk to her. She, however, knowing their thoughts, said to herself, "They will all expect presents, and I have no presents for so many men. The tower must be stopped before it get any higher." So she made all the men working at the tower to talk different languages, so that they could not understand one another, and when one said bring a stone, they would fetch water or a stick, and so forth, so that all was confusion, and the tower abandoned, and hence the different tongues of the various tribes of man.

'There was once a country under a powerful chief with great armies and the people thought they would mount up to heaven by building a ladder of wood. So they builded a stair, and made the stair very high into heaven. Now the men who were up at the top asked for more wood, and the men who were below made answer, "There is no wood; shall we cut a piece from the stair?" So the men at the top not understanding what they said gave answer, "Ay, cut it." So they cut it, and the ladder fell, and great was the fall thereof, and they that builded it were killed.'¹

Trusteeship.

The best missionary book that we have had for a long season is entitled *China and Modern Medicine* (United Council for Missionary Education; 5s. net.). The author, Mr. Harold Balme, F.R.C.S., D.P.H., Dean of the School of Medicine in Shantung Christian University, tells the story of the victory which the medical missionaries in China have won, the way they have won it, and the use they mean to make of it. He tells also the secret of the success. The secret is trusteeship.

'There is a second great ideal which, while not perhaps entirely confined to modern times, may also be claimed as one of the greatest contributions which western medicine has had to offer to the world. This is the conception of trusteeship, in relation both to medical knowledge and to the care of the sick.

'The doctrine of mandates, as at present understood, is a direct product of those newer ideas of international responsibility which have found their expression in the League of Nations. But the application of this doctrine had a much earlier origin in respect to individuals. It sprang into

being on the first occasion that a physician taught that all medical discovery, and all knowledge as to the causation and treatment of disease, were the common heritage of every practitioner of medicine, and not the private monopoly of the discoverer himself. And when one begins to consider the implications of that teaching—particularly against the background of those countries where no such doctrine has ever been taught—the immense potentiality of such a truly Christian conception at once seizes the imagination.

'Think for a moment where medicine would be to-day if Jenner had set up a private consulting room for the practice of vaccination, and had never made it possible for others to share in his discovery. Think of the appalling and unnecessary suffering that hundreds of thousands would have endured if Morton and Simpson had appropriated to themselves the sole right to the administration of anæsthetics, the secret of which might well have died with them. Where would surgery be if Joseph Lister had not made his antiseptic principles freely accessible to one and all? Where, indeed, could we point to any triumphs of modern medicine, had it not been for the fact that this conception of trusteeship has been the dominating ideal of every medical investigator of modern times?

'Nor was it only in the realm of medical discovery that this new ideal became operative. In spite of certain regrettable exceptions, the sense of trusteeship has gradually become the fundamental conception governing the attitude of physician and nurse towards their patient, with the result that everything connected with the sick man—his health, his life, his very confidence—is regarded as a sacred trust, for which his doctor is answerable to God and to his fellows. It is around this central thought that the whole of our modern system of medical and nursing ethics has been built up. Hospitals and dispensaries, Red Cross Societies and asylums, have all alike been organized as an embodiment of this creed. And the faithful work of every conscientious physician and nurse has been an exposition of this underlying sense of personal responsibility for the patient's welfare.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

¹ J. H. Hutton, *The Angami Nagas*, p. 265.